

The University of Chicago

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT
OF THE POWERS AND DUTIES
OF THE CITY-SCHOOL
SUPERINTENDENT

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1935

By

THOMAS McDOWELL GILLAND

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1935

THE ORIGIN AND
DEVELOPMENT OF THE POWER AND
DUTIES OF THE CITY-SCHOOL
SUPERINTENDENT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, CHICAGO

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO., NEW YORK; THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY
PRESS, LONDON; THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, TOKYO, OSAKA,
KYOTO, FUKUOKA, SENDAI; THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LIMITED, SHANGHAI

The University of Chicago

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT
OF THE POWERS AND DUTIES
OF THE CITY-SCHOOL
SUPERINTENDENT

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1935

By

THOMAS McDOWELL GILLAND

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1935

COPYRIGHT 1935 BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. PUBLISHED FEBRUARY 1935

COMPOSED AND PRINTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.



INTRODUCTION

The literature on educational administration is conspicuously barren in historical accounts of the origin and development of our leading officers in public-school administration. Such accounts as do exist are fragmentary and report chiefly episodes of these officers in the management of local schools. As a result the basis for generalization regarding the professional status of modern administrative officers in public schools is decidedly inadequate.

The author of the investigation herewith presented undertook as the problem of his Doctoral investigation to trace the rise and development of the powers and duties of one of these officers, namely, the superintendent of city schools. The data which made the investigation possible were secured in the official proceedings of boards of education and the annual reports of officers of boards of education. At much personal expense transcripts of pertinent board proceedings were collected, and through extensive reading the published reports of thirty cities were carefully examined. These sources yielded the data essential in determining the order of development of the principal powers and duties of city superintendents and the conditions which gave impetus to this development.

The investigation furnishes for the first time a comprehensive account of the evolution of the city superintendency and the conditions which gave rise to the transfer of legal powers and responsibilities by lay boards of education to professional officers. The study also reveals the struggle which has taken place between the boards and their executive officers in the attempt to provide an efficient administration of the public schools.

City superintendents of schools and members of boards of education who desire to follow the rise of public-school administration from the simple managerial acts of the school committees in colonial times to the present technical services of professionally-trained school executives will find in this treatise an illuminating exposition of the development of the superintendency and the order in which the professional duties of the superintendents were acquired from school committees and boards. The study also reveals the rapid rise of the city school superintendent both as a leader in the development of school policies and as an intermediary between the board of education and the public.

Inasmuch as the present status of the city school superintendent both in the country at large and in most communities varies greatly and is in a condition of constant flux, an investigation which reveals the evolution of the position should prove especially valuable at this time. The study by Doctor Gilland should therefore contribute much towards the determination of the proper status of the modern city superintendent and the establishment of his major professional duties.

William C. Reavis

University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	xii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Nature of the Problem	
The Sources of Information	
The Organization of the Investigation	
 II. HOW CITY SCHOOLS WERE ADMINISTERED PREVIOUS TO THE EMPLOYMENT OF A SUPERINTENDENT	 6
The Growth of Cities	
Need for a Superintendent of Schools as Expressed by Lay Boards of Education	
Size of School Systems at Time of Employment of the First Superintendent of Schools	
Administrative and Supervisory Organizations in Specific Cities	
Baltimore	
Boston	
Cincinnati	
Detroit	
Louisville	
Summary	
 III. POWERS AND DUTIES FIRST ASSIGNED TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS	 32
Source of Materials for the Chapter	
Authority Appointing the First Superintendent, Date of Appointment, Length of Term, Salary	
Removal from Office	
Unusual Features in the Dates of Appointment of Some First Superintendents	
Term of the Superintendent	
Salary of First Superintendents	
Duties and Responsibilities of the Office of Superintendent of Schools When the Position Was Created	

Act Under Direction of Board	
Superintendents' Responsibilities to Committees of the Board of Education	
Superintendents' Responsibilities for the Financial Administration	
Superintendents' Responsibilities for the School Plant	
Superintendents' Responsibilities for Reports	
Annual reports	
Quarterly reports	
Monthly reports	
Reports on request	
Cities requiring no reports	
Superintendents' Responsibilities for the Teaching Staff	
Assist in examining applicants for teaching positions	
Conduct teachers meetings	
Fill temporary vacancies	
Report incompetent teachers	
Assist in teacher education	
Recommend teachers for election	
Superintendents' Responsibilities for Instruction	
Supervise the schools	
Visit the schools	
Guard classification of pupils	
Assist in selection of books	
Cause course of study to be followed	
Aid teachers in discipline	
Provide books for indigent pupils	
Superintendents' Responsibilities for Pupil Personnel	
Assist in or conduct examinations for promotion	
Make promotions	
Devise record and report forms	
Keep register of pupils	
Ascertain extent of truancy	
Suspend incorrigible pupils	
Transfer pupils from one district to another	
Admit pupils to school	
Superintendents' Responsibilities for Conducting Office	

Keep daily office hours	
Devote full time to office	
Communicate directions to teachers and pupils	
Have discretionary power	
Keep record of his own activities	
Study local school system	
Study other school systems	
Superintendents' Responsibilities for High Schools	
Responsibilities Found in Individual Cities	
Summary of the Original Duties of Superintendents of Schools in Twenty-six Cities of the United States	
IV. DUTIES OF THE SUPERINTENDENT WITH RESPECT TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A GRADED SYSTEM OF SCHOOLS.	75
Early Classification of Schools	
Wide Variation in Early Classification	
Problems Which Confronted the Superintendent in Grading Lancastrian or Monitorial Schools	
School Building Problems in Connection with Grading the Schools	
Combining Schools and Grades	
Developing a Course of Study	
Providing for the Promotion of Pupils	
Development of Ungraded Classes	
Summary	
V. THE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SUPERINTENDENT FOR ORGANIZING A PROGRAM OF SUPERVISION	99
The Nature of Supervision	
The Need for a Special Supervisory Officer	
Sub-Boards and Visiting Committees	
Supervising Principals	
Assistant Superintendents	
Institutes and Teachers' Meetings	
Effect of Introduction of New Subjects into the Curriculum of the Schools	
Summary	
VI. HOW THE SUPERINTENDENT BECAME THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION	123
The Board of Education	

Methods of Appointment and Length of Term of Members of Boards of Education	
Relationship Between Boards of Education and City Councils	
The Size of Boards of Education	
Number and Duties of Committees of Boards of Education	
Nature of the Reports of Standing Committees	
Designating the Superintendents as the Executive Officers of the Board of Education	
Duties of the Superintendent in the Selection of Teachers	
Summary	
 VII. POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS ACQUIRED THROUGH THE EXPANSION OF THE SCHOOL PROGRAM .	170
Changes in Length of School Course	
The Enlargement of the Course of Study	
Compulsory School Attendance	
New Types of Service for Deviate Children	
Fact Finding as a Basis for Determining Policies	
Curriculum Revision	
Summary	
 VIII. THE SUPERINTENDENTS' RESPONSIBILITIES FOR BUILDING AND FINANCE PROGRAMS	217
Early School Plants Inadequate	
The Superintendents' Early Responsibilities with Respect to the Erection of School Buildings	
Rapidly Increasing School Enrolment	
The Development of School Building Programs	
The Financial Administration of City School Systems	
The Development of Stricter Accounting Procedures	
Public Relations of City School Systems	
Parent-teacher associations	
School bulletins	
The public press	
Wider use of the school plant	
Other measures	
Summary	

Chapter	Page
IX. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	264
Early School Administration without a Superin- tendent	
The Creation of the City School Superintendency	
The Superintendent as Supervisor and Administrator	
A Significant Change in the Status of the Super- intendent	
The Superintendent as an Executive Officer	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	278

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Annual Reports of School Districts Examined in Collection of Materials	3
II. Growth of Twelve Leading Cities During the Thirty-Year Period, 1820-1850	7
III. Data Pertaining to the Appointment of First Superintendents of Schools in Thirty Cities of the United States	15
IV. List of Cities Requested to Furnish Information on Duties of the Superintendent of Schools When the Office Was Created	33
V. Authority Appointing, Date of Appointment, Term and Salary of the First Superintendent of Schools in Twenty-seven Cities of the United States	34
VI. Responsibilities of First Superintendents to the Boards of Education	40
VII. Responsibilities of First Superintendents for the School Plant	46
VIII. Responsibilities of First Superintendents for Reports	49
IX. Date of Submittance and Required Content of Annual Reports by First Superintendents	50
X. Responsibilities of First Superintendents for Teaching Staff	54
XI. Responsibilities of First Superintendents for Instruction	58
XII. Responsibilities of First Superintendents for Pupil Personnel	62

Table	Page
XIII. Responsibilities of First Superintendents for Conducting Office	66
XIV. The Duties and Responsibilities of Twenty-six Superintendents of Schools at the Time the Office Was Created	72
XV. An Analysis of the Duties and Responsibilities of Twenty-six Superintendents of Schools at the Time the Office Was Created	73
XVI. Designations of Superintendents as the Executive Officer of Boards of Education	154
XVII. Increase in School Enrolment of Twenty-six Selected Cities of the United States During Two Thirty-Year Periods (1870-1900 and 1900-1930)	226
XVIII. The Percentages of Increase in Average Yearly Capital Outlay in Fifteen Cities of the United States During Two Thirty-Year Periods	241
XIX. The Percentages of Increase in Average Yearly Current Expenditures in Seventeen Cities of the United States During Two Thirty-Year Periods	247

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Nature of the Problem

The problem for investigation in this study is the origin and development of the powers and duties of the city-school superintendent. In most cities the superintendent still holds his office, exercises his powers, and performs his duties at the discretion and will of the board of education. In a few cities, which are governed by special charters, the superintendent possesses a legal status, that is, his powers are conferred by the legislature of the state, but in general the city superintendent is an executive officer without legal status.

The relationship developed in the course of approximately one-hundred years between boards of education in city-school systems and their superintendents of schools is a matter of great interest to persons concerned with problems of educational administration. The nature of the authority conferred by legislatures on city boards of education through both general law and special grants is generally known to the student of administration. The nature of the powers conferred by local boards of education on their superintendents and the origin and development of the duties performed by the superintendents are less definitely known. The reason for the lack of knowledge in the latter case is due very largely to the fact that the office of city-school superintendent has developed in response to state and local conditions without the influence of any general standardizing agency. Knowledge of successful and unsuccessful practices in city-school administration has been passed on from city to city through various mediums with the ultimate result that a more or less common body of established practices now exist. Generalizations with respect to these practices may be found in the literature on city-school administration, but no adequate account of the development of the relation of boards of education and superintendents in city-school systems, or the rise and development of the powers and duties of the superintendent as the executive officer of the board of education has ever been prepared.

The Sources of Information

The literature on the subject is widely scattered. Some of it can be secured in libraries which collect fugitive materials, such as annual reports of city school systems, school laws, rules and regulations of boards of education, printed minutes of board meetings, and the like. Such materials were not considered valuable except to the local communities until in comparatively recent times. As a result continuous files of the records of many city school systems can be found only in the archives of the individual school systems.

The development of the problem with which this study is concerned has required an extensive survey of the types of literature enumerated in the foregoing paragraph. The chief source of information has been the annual reports of school systems in thirty cities of the United States. The reports were examined and analyzed for the purpose of determining the duties and responsibilities of the superintendents and how and when the duties and responsibilities were acquired. More than eighteen hundred annual reports were consulted in gathering the necessary data and information.

Table I shows the number and distribution of annual reports examined in collecting materials for the study. Significant sections of the reports which dealt with the powers and duties of the superintendent were noted as the reports were read. These selected sections were later typed and the typed materials were filed by cities. The examination of the reports revealed a number of major problems which had a distinct bearing on the development of the powers and duties of the superintendent. When a given problem or phase of the responsibilities of the superintendent was being considered the typed materials bearing on the problem were assembled for as many cities as data were available. The assembled materials for each city were then indexed by dates and the analysis was begun. The analysis traced the responsibilities of the superintendent through all of the data which were available on the problem. When the responsibility had become one of the functions of the office of the superintendent of schools it was considered established as part of the powers and duties of the superintendent.

In the selection of school systems for study, it was necessary to choose cities for which a fairly complete file of annual reports was available. The cities were chosen in such a way that the entire United States was sampled. According to the 1930 census, the population range of the cities was from 140,267 (Nashville) to 6,930,446 (New York). A span of forty-six years

TABLE I

ANNUAL REPORTS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS EXAMINED
IN COLLECTION OF MATERIALS

Cities	Dates of Reports										Totals
	1830	1840	1850	1860	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910	1920	
	to 1839	to 1849	to 1859	to 1869	to 1879	to 1889	to 1899	to 1909	to 1919	to 1929	
Atlanta....	--	--	--	1	5	3	9	3	1	--	22
Baltimore..	2	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	90
Boston.....	--	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	90
Chicago.....	--	--	1	6	10	10	10	10	9	8	64
Cincinnati.	6	10	10	9	9	10	8	10	7	5	84
Cleveland..	--	3	8	6	10	10	10	10	10	5	72
Columbus...	--	7	--	--	8	10	10	10	8	4	57
Dallas.....	--	--	--	--	--	3	8	10	3	3	27
Denver.....	--	--	--	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	69
Detroit.....	--	--	5	9	9	10	10	10	10	10	73
Houston....	--	--	--	--	--	10	10	10	10	8	48
Kansas City	--	--	--	--	5	10	10	10	10	10	55
Los Angeles	--	--	--	--	--	10	10	10	5	--	35
Louisville..	--	--	5	9	10	10	9	10	10	10	73
Milwaukee..	--	3	1	7	10	10	10	10	10	10	71
Minneapolis	--	--	--	--	--	10	10	10	5	5	40
Nashville..	--	--	4	2	10	10	10	10	10	8	64
New Haven..	--	--	5	7	6	9	10	10	10	8	65
New Orleans	--	--	--	--	2	6	4	10	10	3	35
New York...	--	1	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	79
Omaha.....	--	--	--	--	6	9	5	10	5	--	35
Philadelphia	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100
Portland...	--	--	--	--	8	10	10	10	10	10	58
Providence..	1	6	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	85
Rochester..	--	1	9	10	10	10	10	3	--	1	54
Salt Lake City.....	--	--	--	--	--	1	10	10	10	10	41
San Fran- cisco.....	--	--	7	10	10	9	10	10	3	8	67
Seattle.....	--	--	--	--	--	6	4	5	10	9	34
St. Louis..	--	--	8	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	78
Washington.	--	6	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	86
Totals..	19	65	119	155	208	266	277	281	246	215	1851

between the dates of appointment of the first superintendents in the cities used in the investigation was found.

In addition to the annual reports, more than two hundred volumes of early periodicals and yearbooks were also examined. The materials from which Chapter III was developed were secured for the most part from files of minute books of boards of education in the cities studied. The present superintendents of schools in these cities furnished the materials from their archives.

The procedure followed in the analysis of the materials from which Chapter III was written differed from the procedure already described. A card was written for each duty or responsibility found in the materials. The cards were then assembled by duties or responsibilities. The next step in the analysis was the construction of a master table which indicated the distribution of duties and responsibilities in all of the twenty-seven cities. The master table included eleven types of major responsibilities entrusted to the superintendent. The eleven types of responsibilities were analyzed and discussed to show the original duties and responsibilities of the early superintendents of schools.

The greater number of the annual reports and other source materials consulted was found in the Library of the University of Chicago. Files not complete in this library were consulted in the Library of the United States Office of Education and the Library of Congress at Washington, D. C. The materials for Philadelphia, Louisville, and in part for St. Louis were collected in the public libraries and school archives of these cities. The annual reports for the 1929-1930 school term were the latest sources consulted in the collection of materials.

The Organization of the Investigation

The establishment of schools, in most cities, antedated the appointment of the first superintendent of schools. Consequently, in the cities studied, some form of administrative and supervisory organization existed before the superintendent was appointed. Chapter II of the investigation deals with this early administrative and supervisory organization, and shows not only how the schools were administered and supervised before a superintendent was appointed, but also how the need for a superintendent originated. Chapter III deals with the original duties assigned to twenty-seven city superintendents when those officers were appointed.

Careful study of the early in-service duties of city superintendents revealed the problems discussed in Chapters IV and V. Chapter IV presents an analysis of the early superintend-

ents' activities in connection with the establishment of a graded system of schools. While the schools were being graded, it was necessary for the superintendent to set up a program of supervision of instruction. Chapter V deals with the duties and responsibilities of the superintendents in setting up a program of supervision.

The boards of education of cities were, up to about 1900, unwieldy both in size and in the number of standing committees. When the boards were reduced in size and the number of standing committees was decreased, the superintendent of schools gained two rather definite powers and responsibilities, namely, the designation as the executive officer of the board of education and the privilege of nominating teachers. Chapter VI considers the acquisition of these two responsibilities by the superintendent.

Course of study or curriculum construction has long been a responsibility of the superintendent of schools. Chapter VII traces the evolution of the modern permanent organization for curriculum revision and construction as developed by the superintendents in the cities under consideration.

The rapid growth of cities in the period from about 1890 to 1930 and the concurrent growth in school population were productive of many problems of school building and finance. Chapter VIII shows how the superintendents acquired duties and responsibilities connected with buildings and finance. The success of the superintendents' efforts along these as well as other lines was made possible through the cultivation of wholesome public relations with his supporting community. The investigation closes with a discussion of the methods and purposes of the programs of public relations.

CHAPTER II

HOW CITY SCHOOLS WERE ADMINISTERED PREVIOUS TO THE EMPLOYMENT OF A SUPERINTENDENT

The Growth of Cities

There were no superintendents of schools in American cities at the time of the adoption of the Federal Constitution. In fact, there were but five cities of 8,000 population or more in the United States at the time of the first federal census in 1790. None of these cities had developed unified school districts. Their schools were of the local community type and were administered by the entire community in town-meetings or by the representative officers of the local communities. The management of the local community schools was a simple matter. A crude school-house was built or an existing building was utilized, a master was hired, and fuel was provided. The remaining administrative duties, if any, were performed by the master. The results achieved in the school by the master were judged by the local community.

If the United States had remained a rural nation as it was in 1790, when only 3.3 per cent of the population were living in centers of 8,000 or more people, the office of city superintendent of schools might not have evolved. It is safe to assume that the development of the office would have been greatly retarded. However, the trend of our development has been from rural to urban life in most of the states. In the thirty years between 1790 and 1820 the population residing in centers of 8,000 and more people increased 261 per cent. In the same period the total population of the United States increased only 145 per cent and the rural population increased only 141 per cent.¹ In spite of the increase in urban population, only six cities in the United States had a population of more than 25,000 in 1820, and only twelve cities more than 8,000.²

¹Reprint of Chapter I, Vol. II (Pages 6-21) Fifteenth Census Reports on Population, p. 9. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1933.

²Ibid.

The period from 1820-1850 was characterized by the rapid growth of urban population, the development of manufacturing and a multiplicity of important inventions. Table II shows the increase in population of twelve of the leading cities of the United States during the period.

TABLE II
GROWTH OF TWELVE LEADING CITIES DURING THE THIRTY
YEAR PERIOD, 1820-1850*

Cities	Population 1820	Population 1850	Increase in Thirty Years	Percentage of Increase in Thirty Years
Cleveland.....	608	17,034	16,428	2,711
Detroit.....	1,422	21,019	19,579	1,378
Cincinnati....	9,642	115,435	105,793	1,097
Louisville....	4,012	43,194	39,182	977
New Orleans...	27,176	116,375	89,199	328
New York.....	123,708	515,547	391,841	317
Providence....	11,767	41,513	29,746	253
Boston.....	43,298	136,881	93,583	216
New Haven.....	7,147	20,345	13,198	185
Baltimore.....	62,738	169,054	103,316	169
Philadelphia..	63,802	121,376	57,574	90
District of Columbia....	33,039	51,687	18,648	56

*Bureau of Census, United States Department of Commerce, Population, Vol. I, 1930, Table II, p. 18 and Table a, p. 746.

The development of manufacturing and the increase in the number of inventions both had a marked influence on the growth of cities. The growth of cities was also accelerated during the period by an influx of immigrants which reached the total of 2,445,815.¹ Large numbers of these immigrants settled in the cities of the North Atlantic states to take the places of the home stock that was migrating westward. The state census of New York for 1845 indicated that more than one-third of the inhabitants of New York City were foreign born.² During the thirty-year

¹Frank T. Carlton, Economic Influences Upon Education Progress in the United States, 1820-1850, p. 32. Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin. Madison, 1908.

²Ibid.

period from 1820 to 1850 the percentage of the total population living in centers of 8,000 and over increased from 4.9 per cent to 12.5 per cent. The increase of the population living in centers of 8,000 and over for the thirty-year period from 1820 to 1850 was 510 per cent, while the increase in the total population of the United States was 255 per cent and the increase in rural population was 111 per cent.¹

The type of administrative organization for schools, which had been effective in the small centers of population, would scarcely be effective for the rapidly growing urban communities. The cities were attaining a size which made imperative a new type of school organization for them. The organizations which were functioning had been evolved through the years as the cities had grown. They were the organizations which had been set up for the small rural or community areas and had been modified slightly as the communities grew larger. Originally, the oversight of the schools had been the duty of an existing civic group of organization. In some communities the selectmen were the responsible body, in others the wardens or overseers or grandjurymen. When the duties with respect to schools became too arduous for these officers to perform, legal permission was granted to appoint or elect a visiting committee to share the duties and responsibilities. At a later date the entire responsibility for administering the schools was placed in the hands of the visiting committees or their successors. Finally, the time arrived when the school committees acknowledged that they could no longer adequately manage the administration of the schools and sought to appoint executive officers to whom they might delegate some of their duties.

Need for a Superintendent of Schools as Expressed by Lay Boards of Education

As cities grew in population the school enrolments increased so rapidly that the lay boards of education began to realize their inability to manage successfully the complex problems of school administration and supervision. In general two reasons were assigned for securing professional leadership and assistance: (1) The members of boards of education were engaged in business pursuits and could not spare the time from their private enterprises. (2) The growth in the complexity and intensity of the problems of administration and supervision had

¹Reprint of Chapter I, Vol. II (Pages 6-21) Fifteenth Census Reports on Population, p. 9. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1933.

rendered the solution of the problems beyond the capabilities of lay boards of education.

The commissioners of the public schools of Baltimore, in the report for 1847, mentioned several reasons why the duties of their office were becoming too arduous.¹ The statement was made that since the schools were becoming more numerous, the labor of supervising them was taking more time than could be spared from the business interests of the members of the board of commissioners. The founders of the schools, the report stated, had never expected the commissioners to be responsible for all of the supervision of a school system so complex as the school system of Baltimore had become. The schools should be supervised by a superintendent who could give all of his time to the duties of his office. In the report of the school commissioners of Baltimore for 1859 mention was again made of the necessity for more supervision.² The treasurer of the school district had been empowered to visit and supervise the schools, but the duties imposed were too onerous for one man to perform. The board of commissioners was forced both to frame its rules and later to execute its own rules through the medium of committee action.

In the report of the Boston schools for 1845 the school committee advanced a number of arguments for the employment of a superintendent.³ The reports submitted by the examining committees were often at variance with each other. This condition was to be expected since men of different tastes, different capacities, and different attitudes of mind were examining the schools. The citizens of Boston were taxing themselves to the extent of more than \$200,000 annually for the support of their schools and were then permitting the schools to operate without adequate supervision. The fact that the school committee was authorized and expected to supervise the schools tended to prevent personal examination by parents. In this manner the school committee was perpetuating and protecting the defects which closer examination by the parents might have disclosed.

The then existing organization of the school committee of Boston was considered, by the members, to be admirable for some purposes. The chief defect was considered to be the inability to

¹Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Schools, p. 27. Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1847.

²Ibid., p. 37. 1858.

³Report of the School Committee, pp. 32-34. Boston School Committee, 1845.

fix administrative responsibility on any one person. The members of the school committee were actuated by different motives when they accepted positions on the committee. Some served because of the desire to be useful to the community, while others served for the financial and personal advantages which accrued from a position of responsibility. The solution seemed to lie in making one man responsible for the supervision of the schools. If the livelihood of one man were made dependent on the quality of service that he rendered he could be held accountable and the condition of the schools could be improved.¹

In the report for 1846 the school committee of Boston advanced additional arguments for the employment of a superintendent.² A member of the school committee could not render intelligent service until he had served at least one year on the committee. During that year, if he were really interested, he collected facts and figures to guide him in making decisions. At the end of his term the member did not leave, for the benefit of the remaining members, the facts and figures which he had collected. A superintendent was therefore required to collect and compile the information which committeemen needed in order to render intelligent service in the administration and supervision of the schools. The information collected could be centralized in the office of the superintendent and would always be available to members of the school committee.

The board of trustees and visitors of the common schools of Cincinnati in the report submitted to the city council in 1833 complained of too much work.³ The annual examination of the schools had been so hastily and inadequately conducted that the members of the committee placed little reliance in the results. The report suggested that the city council should attempt to have legislation passed which would enable the board of trustees and visitors to be increased in size. The request for assistance was renewed in the report for 1836.⁴ The private business of the members of the board of trustees and visitors made it impossible for them to give sufficient time to the administration of the schools. In the report for 1841 mention was made of the lack of interest of some of the members of the board of trustees and

¹Ibid., p. 34. 1845.

²Ibid., pp. 40-41. 1846.

³Report of the Trustees and Visitors of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, pp. 1-3. Cincinnati: Board of Trustees and Visitors, 1833.

⁴Ibid., pp. 13-14. 1836.

visitors. The suggestion was also made that the school law should be amended to provide for forfeiture of office by those members who failed to perform faithfully the duties for which they had been selected. In the same report (1841) the committee on schools of the city council stated that the examinations of the schools had been seriously neglected. The neglect was attributed to the fact that it was extremely difficult to secure members for the board of trustees and visitors who were properly qualified and who could find time to discharge the duties of the office.¹ The report of the trustees and visitors for 1848 made reference to the fact that the schools of Cincinnati were still without the services of a superintendent. This condition existed even though the permanent organization of schools in sister states included the office of superintendent and that officer was deemed indispensable. It was held in the report that a high order of achievement was demanded of all who directed the education of youth and that achievement was possible only from a liberal-minded and thoroughly educated public agent.²

The report of the schools of Columbus for 1847-1848 stated that a superintendent had been chosen.³ The board of education had been unable to give the necessary amount of personal attention to the schools and to the management of the details of the school system. The decision to elect a superintendent had been made after consultation with Henry Barnard of Rhode Island and with other distinguished educators. The decision had also been influenced by the fact that a number of cities had created the office.⁴

The president of the board of education of Detroit, in the report for 1860, cited several reasons why the schools of Detroit needed a general superintendent.⁵ The schools were too numerous and their judicious management too important to be entrusted to the labors of committeemen and the president of the board of education. The inspectors who were appointed to visit and examine the schools were not performing their duties. The schools needed constant supervision or they would deteriorate. The principals of the union schools had been made responsible for the primary schools in their districts. This measure had been of little value

¹Ibid., p. 12. 1841.

²Ibid., p. 44. 1848.

³Third Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 5-6.
Columbus: Board of Education, 1848.

⁴Ibid., p. 6. 1848.

⁵Annual Report of the Public Schools with Accompanying Documents, p. 45. Detroit: Board of Education, 1860.

because the principals were unable to visit the primary schools during the time when the primary schools were in session.¹

The necessity for a superintendent was restated in the report of the president of the board of education of Detroit for 1863.² The opinion was expressed, in this report, that when the number of schools and teachers was much less, the supervision might have been entrusted to the members of the board of education; but that since the schools had grown, it was essential that there should be a competent, earnest superintendent who could give his whole time to the organization and supervision of the schools. The necessity for such an officer was likened to the necessity for a commander-in-chief for the armies which were waging civil war at that time. In the report of the committee on schools the chairman of the committee added several arguments to those advanced by the president.³ He called attention to the fact that most or all of the members of the board of education were engaged in active private pursuits which required their constant attention. The supervision and administration of the schools had become a burden and serious inconvenience to the members of the board of education. It was absurd for the public to expect the members of the board to neglect private business interests in order to have time to devote to the management of the schools. Business experience had demonstrated the wisdom of fixing responsibility in a single individual rather than trying to place it in a group. The committee system in use by the board of education of Detroit was too cumbersome and its greatest weakness was the division of authority. The school system needed a single head, a person who was paid for his services.

The reports of the trustees of the public schools of Washington, D. C., under the provisions of an act effective in 1845, were made to the city council and were signed by the mayor who was ex officio president of the board of education. The board of education was, in most respects, under the direct control of the city council. The trustees recognized and enumerated the needs for a superintendent of schools for a great many years before the officer was authorized by the city council. The report of the trustees issued in 1852 advanced a number of reasons for the appointment of a superintendent.⁴ The trustees found it

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 9-10. 1863.

³Ibid., pp. 23-25.

⁴Annual Report of the Trustees of the Public Schools of the City of Washington, pp. 10-11. Washington: Public School Trustees, 1852.

impossible to devote to the schools the time necessary to insure the successful operation of the schools without neglecting their own business and interests. The trustees were willing to continue to devote all of the time which could be spared. However, they were certain that it was not possible for them to effect the improvements which would be possible under the administration of a superintendent. In the report for 1853 additional arguments were presented. The employment of a superintendent would insure a better system of discipline, a more uniform and perfect mode of instruction, and a more prompt and constant attendance.¹ The recommendations were renewed in the report for 1854.² The statement was made that it was impossible for the trustees to give to the schools the attention which was needed. The trustees had devoted as much of their time as it was possible for them to give, but the schools needed someone who could give daily supervision and who was fitted for the work by both education and habit. In the report for 1856 the claim was made that the schools could be run with the expenditure of less money if they were under the direction of an individual who knew the wants of the schools and the best means of supplying those wants.³

The necessity for a superintendent was kept before the city council in the report for 1860. In this report attention was called to the fact that the condition of the schools and school houses, the supervision of teachers and scholars, and the systematizing of the entire mode of imparting instruction could not receive sufficient attention from the board of trustees.⁴ The report for 1864-65 again enumerated some of the needs for a superintendent.⁵ During that school year the trustees had made 1,663 visits to the schools. The visits were but a small part of the labor of the board. It was necessary to search out and rent rooms, to issue tickets of admission, to attend to the repair of buildings, to examine candidates for the positions of teachers, to examine textbooks. The report for 1870 elaborated on the complexity of the duties and responsibilities of the board of trustees.⁶ During that year one member of the board had been ill, one member had rarely gone to the schools, and two had not gone at all. The eight remaining members of the board had each made

¹Ibid., p. 4. 1853.

²Ibid., p. 7. 1854.

³Ibid., p. 27. 1856.

⁴Ibid., p. 11. 1860.

⁵Ibid., p. 7. 1864.

⁶Ibid., pp. 7-8. 1870.

an average of 853 visits to the schools during the year.¹ Admission and transfer tickets to the number of 9,500 had been issued by the members. Every case of suspension or dismissal of pupils had required investigation. Every article of stationery or supplies had been issued on requisitions signed only after inquiry had been made. The minute details, the report insisted, called for more attention than did those duties which were considered the conspicuous duties usually supposed to belong to the office, namely, school visitation and examination and appointment of teachers.

Size of School Systems at Time of Employment of the
First Superintendent of Schools

Table III presents data on the population, school enrolment, and number of teachers in the thirty cities considered in this investigation, at the time of the appointment of the first superintendent of schools. The data used were secured from annual reports and minute books of the school districts of the cities included in the table. The range in the number of teachers was from four in St. Louis to 2,168 in Philadelphia. The median number of teachers in the thirty cities was thirty-four. Eleven of the cities employed fewer than twenty-five teachers while twenty-one cities, or seventy per cent, employed less than fifty. Only six of the thirty cities employed more than one hundred teachers when the first superintendent of schools was elected.

The range of the number of pupils enrolled in the thirty cities was from 126 in Los Angeles to 105,424 in Philadelphia. The median number of pupils was 2,167. Three of the cities enrolled fewer than 500 pupils, four enrolled less than 1,000 and fourteen enrolled less than 2,000 pupils when the first superintendent was elected, while but four cities enrolled more than 10,000 pupils.

In the thirteen cities employing twenty-five or fewer teachers, it seems evident that the first superintendent was chosen to aid in establishing the school system. In the remaining seventeen cities, those employing more than twenty-five teachers, the superintendent was apparently chosen to aid in solving some of the problems of administration and supervision that had perplexed and baffled the lay boards of education.

The population of the thirty cities at the time the first superintendent of schools was chosen ranged from 1,610 in Los Angeles to 847,170 in Philadelphia. The median population was

¹Ibid., p. 7.

TABLE III

DATA PERTAINING TO THE APPOINTMENT OF FIRST SUPERINTENDENTS
OF SCHOOLS IN THIRTY CITIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Cities	Date of Ap- point- ment	Population at Time of Appointment (Nearest Census)	School En- rolment at Time of Appt. of First Supt.	No. Teachers at Time of Appt. of First Supt.
Louisville, Ky.....	1837	(1840) 17,680	716	10
Providence, R.I.....	1839	(1840) 23,171	1,671	34
St. Louis, Mo.....	1839	(1840) 16,469	260	4
New Orleans, La.....	1841	(1840) 102,193*	350	7
Rochester, N.Y.....	1843	(1840) 20,191	5,650	44
Columbus, Ohio.....	1847	(1850) 17,882	1,750	17
Baltimore, Md.....	1849	(1850) 169,054	6,763	107
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	1850	(1850) 115,435	12,240	138
Boston, Mass.....	1851	(1850) 136,881	19,640	331
New York, N.Y.....	1851	(1850) 515,547	24,290	384
San Francisco, Calif.	1852	(1850) 34,776	1,399	16
Cleveland, Ohio.....	1853	(1850) 17,034	2,700	37
Chicago, Ill.....	1854	(1850) 29,963	2,154	35
Los Angeles, Calif..	1854	(1850) 1,610	126	7
Nashville, Tenn.....	1854	(1850) 10,165	1,203**	25**
Detroit, Mich.....	1855	(1860) 15,169	5,500	41
Milwaukee, Wis.....	1859	(1860) 45,246	4,195	79
New Haven, Conn.....	1859	(1860) 39,267	2,587	59
Kansas City, Mo.....	1868	(1870) 32,260	2,180	21
Washington, D.C.....	1869	(1870) 109,199	5,888	124
Atlanta, Ga.....	1871	(1870) 21,789	2,842	25
Denver, Colo.....	1871	(1870) 4,759	1,013	16
Omaha, Neb.....	1872	(1870) 16,083	1,700	16
Houston, Tex.....	1873	(1870) 9,382	1,228	26
Minneapolis, Minn...	1873	(1870) 13,066	1,971	40
Portland, Ore.....	1873	(1870) 8,293	1,457	24
Seattle, Wash.....	1882	(1880) 3,533	1,877	12
Philadelphia, Pa....	1883	(1880) 847,170	105,424	2,168
Dallas, Tex.....	1888	(1890) 80,067	2,389	35
Salt Lake City, Utah	1888	(1890) 44,843	3,500	50

*Includes New Orleans Parish.

**Figures for 1857 the first available ones.

26,527. Five of the cities had less than 10,000 population, while seven of them had a population of more than 100,000. In seven of the thirty cities the first superintendent of schools was appointed before 1850. The first superintendent was appointed in eleven cities between 1850 and 1860. Two cities made the appointment between 1860 and 1870, six between 1870 and 1880, and four between 1880 and 1890--all of the thirty cities had appointed the first superintendent of schools before 1890.

The amount of funds expended for current expenses during the year in which the first superintendent was chosen was available for twenty-six of the thirty cities. The amount ranged from \$2,500 in Columbus to \$1,503,052 in Philadelphia. The median amount expended was \$32,495.

Administrative and Supervisory Organizations in Specific Cities

The data presented in the foregoing pages reveal the necessity for the appointment of superintendents in city school systems. The evidence indicates that the increasing complexities of the problems of school administration and supervision had developed beyond the acknowledged capabilities of the lay boards of education. The remainder of the chapter will discuss early organizations for school control in specific cities. The school organizations in five cities will be treated in as much detail as the available materials permit. The plans for the cities treated may be considered typical of those in vogue at the time.

Baltimore

The public schools of Baltimore were constituted an independent organization in 1829.¹ In 1828 an ordinance was passed in the city council dividing the city into six districts for school purposes.² Originally, there was a board of six commissioners which had charge of the schools.³ In 1834 the number was increased to nine, in 1838 to thirteen, in 1842 to fourteen, and in 1846 to twenty.⁴ The commissioners were appointed by the mayor and city council. The commissioners were responsible to these officials and derived their authority from them.

¹Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Schools,
p. 11. Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1850.

²Ibid., p. 12.

³Ibid., p. 13.

⁴Ibid.

The rules of order of the board of commissioners of the schools of Baltimore, printed in the annual report for 1857, list fifteen standing committees of the board.¹ In addition to the fifteen standing committees, there was a visiting committee of two members for each of the grammar and primary schools. The duties of the high-school and visiting committees, as indicated in the report, were to:

1. Provide for examination for entrance to High School.
2. Visit schools, either as a committee or individually.
3. Examine the condition and order of the schools.
4. Grant certificates of admission.
5. Sign requisitions for books and stationery.
6. Make weekly report, at meetings of commissioners, on all matters relating to preservation, repairs, and cleanliness of the school property.²

The visiting committees of the primary schools were required to transfer pupils from the primary to the grammar schools when the examination should show them qualified.³ These committees were also obligated to report delinquent teachers to the board of commissioners.

The Committees on Grammar Schools were required to:

1. Visit the schools semi-annually.
2. Examine the classes.
3. See that course of study was followed and authorized books were used.
4. Ascertain the mode of instruction and discipline used by the teachers.
5. Make a report to the board of their findings.
6. See that the directions of the board were carried out.
7. Make written report to board before the annual election of teachers.⁴

The Committees on Primary Schools were required to:

1. Visit the schools semi-annually.
2. Ascertain the proficiency of the pupils.
3. See that board regulations were observed.
4. Recommend improvements to the board.
5. Make written report to the board before the annual election of teachers.⁵

¹Annual Report of Commissioners of Public Schools, p. 6.
Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1857.

²Ibid., p. 9.

³Ibid., p. 10.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

The Committee on Books was required to:

1. Make recommendations on books and stationery presented for use in the schools.
2. Make an annual examination of books and stationery used in the schools and recommend additions or alterations.
3. Advertise for proposals for furnishing the schools with books and stationery.
4. Examine the monthly bills for books and stationery.
5. Make no contracts nor annul any unless first voted on by the board.¹

The Committee on Examinations was ordered to:

1. Ascertain the literary qualifications of all applicants for teachers except those for music teachers.
2. Require satisfactory testimonials from all applicants for teaching positions.
3. Report the results of all examinations to the board.
4. Examine all candidates, among the teachers, for promotion to higher grades.
5. Examine, upon request of the board, any teachers employed in the schools.²

In the annual report for 1845 the board of school commissioners of Baltimore requested the council to allow them to appoint a superintendent of schools.³ The position taken by the commissioners was that the duties of membership on the board of commissioners were taking too much time from the business interests of the board members. Had the request been granted, it was the intention of the board to appoint one of its own members to the position and pay him for his services. In 1847 the board appointed a committee of its members to inquire in what respects, if any, the school system might be improved.⁴ This committee made an investigation of school systems in other cities and reported its findings to the board. Among the recommendations made was one for the election of a superintendent of schools. There was, however, so much opposition to some of the recommendations that no action was taken on the report presented.⁵

In 1848 the treasurer of the Baltimore school district was given some responsibilities for supervision of the schools.⁶

¹Ibid., p. 11.

²Ibid., p. 12.

³Ibid., pp. 8-9. 1845.

⁴Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Schools,
p. 7. Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1847.

⁵Ibid., p. 8.

⁶Annual Report of Board of Commissioners of Public Schools,
p. 5. Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1866.

Apparently the duties of the combined office were heavy, and supervision received little attention from the treasurer. The treasurer, as intended by the plan, was to act as a general visitor and examiner, working in conjunction with the local committee appointed for the several schools.¹ This plan was followed until 1857, when the duties of the treasurer were modified and he was given more time for supervision.² To lighten further the duties of the treasurer, a clerk was appointed to assist in the financial duties of the officer. The clerk's duties were largely those of a bookkeeper and accountant. The duties of the treasurer were those of a business manager and inspector combined and were concerned with both the business and instructional phases of the school system.³ The first report of the treasurer-superintendent appears in 1859; it is signed as treasurer rather than superintendent.⁴ In the report for 1863 mention is made of the duties of the visiting committees.⁵ It is evident that the treasurer was not expected to have complete control over the supervision of the schools. The treasurer in the report for 1864 recommended that assistants be provided in sufficient numbers to allow the principals of the schools to devote more of their time to supervision.⁶ The commissioners were apparently performing many duties in connection with the administration and supervision of the schools as late as 1865. The treasurer in the report for that year mentioned the fact that the board was divided into committees to which were committed the oversight of the schools.⁷ Applicants for admission into the primary and grammar schools were required to have certificates of admission from the commissioner in charge of the school to which they wished to be admitted.⁸ At the regular meetings of the board these certificates were called for and filed. In 1866 the duties of the treasurer and superintendent were separated and the combination officer was made superintendent of schools.⁹ It is interesting to note that

¹Annual Report of Commissioners of Public Schools, p. 32. Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1857.

²Ibid., p. 46. 1859.

³Ibid., pp. 5-8. 1857.

⁴Ibid., p. 133. 1859.

⁵Annual Report of Board of Commissioners of Public Schools, pp. 9-10. Baltimore: Board of Commissioners, 1863.

⁶Ibid., p. 85. 1865.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., p. 5. 1866.

twenty-one years elapsed from the time the necessity of appointing a superintendent of schools was first mentioned until that officer was finally appointed.

Boston

The earliest schools of Boston were under the direction of nine selectmen of the town.¹ The selectmen were under the control of the voters assembled in town meeting. Salaries were fixed, masters elected, and in many other ways an active part was taken by the town meeting in the management of the schools.² This type of control began in 1635 and lasted until 1789. From 1789 to 1822 the schools were in charge of a committee consisting of the nine selectmen and one citizen from each of the twelve wards.³ From 1822 to 1836 the first charter provided that the school committee should consist of the mayor, the board of aldermen, and one citizen from each ward elected annually.⁴ In 1835 the city charter was amended and the personnel of the school committee changed. The school committee was then composed of the mayor, the president of common council, and two citizens from each ward elected annually.⁵

According to the rules and regulations passed in 1841 for the administration and supervision of the Boston schools, each school had a visiting or sub-committee.⁶ The committees for the Latin and English high schools consisted of five members each and those for the other schools of three members each. In addition to these committees, there were a committee on books, one on music, and one on conference with the members of the primary school committee.⁷ The primary school committee, a sub-committee of the school committee, was made up of three men from each ward of the city and had complete control over the primary schools.⁸ This committee continued to function until it was abolished by the charter of 1854.⁹

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools,
School Document No. 9, pp. 38-39. Boston: School Committee, 1906.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Rules of the School Committee of the City of Boston,
pp. 3-10. Boston: School Committee, 1841.

⁷Ibid., p. 10.

⁸Third Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools,
p. 32. Boston: School Committee, 1853.

⁹Ibid., p. 39.

The duties of the sub-committees were to:

1. Examine the classes in their respective schools at least one each quarter.
2. Visit their schools at least once each month.
3. Make a quarterly report on the condition of the schools and school property in their district.
4. Determine the scholars who were to receive medals.
5. Give advice to teachers in emergencies, and handle difficulties that arose.
6. Appoint teachers for temporary vacancies.
7. Make temporary arrangements found to be necessary.
8. Perform all their duties as a committee and not as individuals.

Two examining committees were appointed in May of each year, one for the English grammar schools and the other for the writing schools.¹ The regular sub- or visiting committees of the Latin school and the English high schools examined these schools.² The examining committees were directed to examine critically the pupils in all branches of study taught in the respective schools. The report on the examinations was to be made previous to the annual election of teachers. This regulation was operative for the visiting committees of the high schools as well as for the examining committees of the other schools.³

These examining committees functioned in the schools of Boston up to 1875,⁴ in which year the size of the school committee was reduced and a board of six supervisors was appointed to take over the duties previously performed by the visiting and examining committees.⁵

The first mention of the desirability of having a superintendent for the schools of Boston was made in the report of the examining committee of the grammar schools for 1845.⁶ The reasons given for the need of a superintendent were that such an officer would give permanence, personal responsibility, and systematic labor to the school organization. The next year, 1846, the visiting committee in its report again made mention of the need of a superintendent. The argument given in this report was that the

¹Ibid., p. 10.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Annual Report of Superintendent of Public Schools, School Document No. 9, pp. 38-39. Boston: School Committee, 1906.

⁵Ibid., p. 39.

⁶Report of the Grammar School Committee, p. 32. Boston: School Committee, 1845.

members of the school committee served but one year and as a result there was no continuity of school policies.¹ The report of the school committee for 1847 mentioned the need of a superintendent to correlate the primary and grammar schools.²

On May 19, 1847, a sub-committee was appointed and directed to consider and report what measures might be adopted to enable the school committee to discharge its duties most effectively.³ This committee reported on August 30, 1847, in a lengthy document, and was unanimous in believing that there was need for revising the administration of the school system, but it was divided in the manner in which this revision should be made.⁴ Part of the committee thought a single, responsible executive officer should be appointed; another part of the committee felt that the same ends would be achieved by having three or more members of the school committee act as the executive power of the board. These members were to be paid for their services.⁵

Finally, on January 21, 1851, the school committee appointed a committee to confer with a committee from the city council on the subject of a superintendent of schools. This committee met with the committee on public instruction of the city council on February 21, 1851.⁶ There was unanimous agreement on the need for a city superintendent of schools and on March 31, 1851, an order was passed through both houses of the city council creating the office.⁷ The first superintendent was elected on May 13, 1851.⁸ It is interesting to note that the man, Nathan Bishop, who was elected first superintendent of the Boston schools in 1851, had been elected first superintendent of schools in Providence, Rhode Island, in 1839.

Mention has been made of the creation, in 1818, of a sub-committee of the school committee to have charge of the primary

¹School Committee Reports. Boston: School Committee, 1841-1850. Grammar School Committee Report for 1845, p. 40. Boston: School Committee, 1850.

²Reports of the Intermed. School Committee, p. 62. Boston: School Committee, 1847.

³School Reports. Boston: School Committee, 1841-1850. Appendix to Visiting Committee Reports, p. 117. Boston: Visiting Committee, 1847.

⁴Report of the School Committee, City Document, No. 43, pp. 117-22. Boston: School Committee, 1847.

⁵Ibid., p. 122.

⁶Third Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, p. 21. Boston: School Committee, 1853.

⁷Ibid., p. 23.

⁸Ibid., p. 24.

schools. This committee exercised complete control over the primary schools of Boston and at the time it was abolished by the charter of 1854, the primary committee had grown to the number of 196 members.¹ As early as 1838 attempts were made to modify the primary school organization by electing a superintendent or agent for those schools.² This movement was keenly resented by the members of the primary committee who attributed the attempt to Secretary Mann's policy of centralization of the school organization. The primary school committee was large, powerful, and close to the people; consequently its influence was a factor with which to be reckoned. There was also an ingrained conservatism apparent, a feeling that since the then existing organization had carried on successfully, it should be continued.³ It was with a great deal of reluctance and with many doubts that the members of the primary committee submitted to the charter which legislated them out of existence. In fact, the entire school committee of Boston looked upon the election of the superintendent as an experiment. They had the feeling that the old organization could be reestablished if the new plan did not work effectively. The superintendent was elected for a term of one year only.⁴

Cincinnati

The public schools of Cincinnati were established in 1829.⁵ The city was divided into ten school districts, two in each ward.⁶ The city charter provided that one trustee and visitor was to be elected annually by the qualified voters in each ward. This board of five trustees and visitors was to have the superintendence of the schools.⁷ One of the important duties of the board of trustees and visitors was the appointment of six persons, residents and citizens of the city, to constitute the

¹Annals of the Primary School Committee, p. 271. Boston: School Committee, 1860.

²Ibid., p. 178.

³Ibid., p. 278.

⁴Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, City Document, No. 16, p. 6. Boston School Committee, 1851-1868.

⁵Acts of a General Nature Passed at the Twenty-seventh General Assembly, XXVII, 35. Columbus: Olmstead, Bailhache and Cameron State Printers, 1829.

⁶Fourth Annual Report of the Trustees and Visitors of the Common Schools, p. 12. Cincinnati: Committee of Trustees and Visitors, 1833.

⁷Ibid., p. 13.

board of examiners and inspectors of the schools.¹ This latter board was charged with the duties of examining the qualifications, competence, and moral characters of prospective teachers, the examining of the schools, and the suggestion of improvements in the government and discipline of the schools. As early as 1832 the board of trustees and visitors urged the necessity for additional members of their body.² Their argument for the increase was the fact that examining the schools was an arduous task which took too much time of those designated to perform it.³ There is evidence to believe that the board of examiners were not too keenly interested in that part of the work assigned to them.⁴ Again in 1836 the trustees requested additional help on the board of trustees and visitors.⁵ In 1839 the chairman of the committee on schools of the city council commented on the dereliction of the board of examiners and inspectors and their failure to make a report to the city council every three months as the charter provision required.⁶

The tenth annual report of the trustees and visitors of the schools of Cincinnati listed the duties of the principal teachers of each school. From this list it is apparent that the principal teachers were held responsible for a large amount of the administration and supervision of the school building over which they had charge.⁷

In 1836 the charter of Cincinnati was revised and the regulations concerning the appointment of the trustees and visitors and the examiners and inspectors were changed.⁸ Under the new charter two trustees and visitors were elected for each ward and seven examiners and inspectors were appointed by the city council rather than by the board of trustees and visitors.⁹

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 2.

³Ibid.

⁴Fifth Annual Report of the Trustees and Visitors of the Common Schools, p. 6. Cincinnati: Committee of Trustees and Visitors, 1834.

⁵Seventh Annual Report of the Common Schools, p. 14. Cincinnati: Committee of Trustees and Visitors, 1836.

⁶Tenth Annual Report of the Trustees and Visitors of the Common Schools, p. 19. Cincinnati: Committee of Trustees and Visitors, 1839.

⁷Ibid., pp. 22-24.

⁸Ibid., p. 28.

⁹Ibid.

The duties of the trustees and visitors were to:

1. Fill vacancies that might occur in their own body.
2. Have general superintendence over the schools.
3. Make regulations for the government of the schools.
4. Appoint and employ teachers.
5. Visit every school at least once each month.
6. Have census taken in the month of March.
7. Require teachers to keep an accurate record of pupils attending school.
8. Certify the school expenses to the city council.
9. Make an annual report to the city council.
10. Perform other duties which would promote the interests of the schools.
11. Employ no teachers that had not been certificated by the board of examiners and inspectors.¹

The duties of the examiners and inspectors were to:

1. Examine the qualifications, competency and moral character of all candidates for teaching positions.
2. Grant certificates to candidates found competent.
3. Examine all schools as often as they deem it proper.
4. Give attention to the discipline, teaching and progress of the schools.
5. Make reports to the city council once every three months.
6. Make reports to board of trustees with recommendations for changes and improvements.
7. Hold meetings on the first Monday of each month.²

The trustees and visitors in addition to the duties specified also held weekly and quarterly meetings of the teaching staff. The weekly meetings were for the purpose of the professional improvement of the teachers, the quarterly meetings for the discussion of the rules and plans of the school system.³

In their report for 1847 the board of trustees and visitors called the attention of the city council to the need of having a superintendent of schools. The superintendent, it was felt, was needed to take charge of the educational department of the schools; the business department was to remain under the control of the board.⁴ The chief reason cited for the desired appointment was

¹Ibid., pp. 26-27.

²Ibid., p. 28.

³Fourteenth Annual Report of the Trustees and Visitors of the Common Schools to the City Council, p. 34. Cincinnati: City Council, 1843.

⁴Ibid., p. 46. 1847.

the fact that the educational affairs required too much time from the private responsibilities of the board members. In the report for 1848 reference was again made to the fact that Cincinnati had no superintendent of schools. This report also mentioned that some of the duties of the superintendent were performed by the principal of the central schools.¹

The first superintendent of the schools of Cincinnati was chosen by popular vote in the spring of 1850.² In the report for 1851 mention was made of the duties of the superintendent.³ The duties were, it was said, more advisory than practical; neither the course of study nor the organization was confided to him. However, the superintendent was given credit for rendering valuable services to the schools.⁴ At the time of the election of the first superintendent of the schools of Cincinnati the board of trustees and visitors was composed of thirty-two members; the board of examiners of the schools had seven members; and there were seventeen standing committees.⁵ An organization of this type would seem to permit of little real responsibility being given to the superintendent of schools.

In 1887 the superintendent of Cincinnati in a report to the board denounced the system of local trustees with supervisory powers.⁶ As a result of his tirade, the Ohio Legislature in 1887 passed a law which abolished the local trustees and gave the superintendent of schools the authority to recommend teachers.⁷ Two years later, in 1889, the same superintendent was defeated for reelection by the people who had been denied the privileges of exercising the power of local trustees.⁸

Detroit

The city of Detroit was made a school district by the provisions of an act passed in 1842.⁹ District schools had been

¹Ibid., p. 8. 1848.

²Ibid., p. 4. 1850.

³Ibid., p. 10. 1851.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 84.

⁶The Ohio Educational Monthly and the National Teacher, p. 144. Akron: 1887.

⁷Ibid., pp. 195-96.

⁸Ibid., p. 275. 1889.

⁹The Introductory Report of the Board of Education of the City of Detroit, pp. 27-30. Detroit: Board of Education, 1842.

established previous to the passage of the act of 1842, but they had met with indifferent success.¹ The act of 1842 created a board of education consisting of two inspectors from each ward, the mayor and the recorder. The board of education appointed four standing committees, three of which had general charge of the administration and supervision of the schools.² The committee on teachers and school books was charged with the responsibilities (1) of examining and certificating teachers and (2) of designating the books to be used in the schools. In addition to the duties mentioned, this committee was expected to visit each of the schools at least once in each quarter of twelve weeks. In visiting, it was the duty of the committee to inspect the conditions of the schools, to ascertain the improvement of the scholars, and to give hints to the teachers which might result in better conduct of the schools.³

The school plant of Detroit was under the direction of the Committee on School Houses. This committee was responsible for the condition of the school houses, their repairs, their heating, and the school furniture used. The committee had power to make contracts for repairs and improvements not to exceed fifty dollars.⁴ The third committee which had responsibilities in connection with the administration and supervision of the schools was the Committee on Schools.

The committee's duties were listed as follows:

1. See that the teachers complied with the regulations of the school board.
2. See that incorrigible pupils were suspended.
3. See that admission to the schools was granted in accordance with the regulations of the board.
4. See that scholars were properly distributed among the several schools of the city.
5. See that teachers were given advice in cases of difficulty.
6. See that some one of the members of the committee visited each school monthly or more frequently.⁵

¹A. B. Moehlman, Public Education in Detroit, p. 69. Bloomington: Public School Publishing Co., 1924.

²The Revised Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of the City of Detroit, pp. 7-10. Detroit: Board of Education, 1846.

³Ibid., pp. 7-8.

⁴Ibid., p. 8.

⁵Ibid., p. 9.

In addition to the oversight of the various committees, the members of the board from each ward were constituted a vigilance committee for the schools of their ward. These board members were required to examine into the condition of the schools of their wards at least once each month and report the result of their observations to the proper standing committees of the board.¹

By an act of the Michigan Legislature passed in 1855 the Detroit board of education was authorized to appoint a superintendent of schools.² The board appointed a superintendent of schools who served for one year.³ At the end of the year he resigned because of the low salary paid for the position.⁴ The employment of a superintendent is not mentioned again in the available reports until 1861. In the report for 1861 the president of the board of education referred to the need for a superintendent to supervise the instruction offered in the schools. The supervision which the principals of the union schools were able to give was insufficient and the members of the board of inspectors were not giving the amount of attention that the schools needed.⁵ The enrolment of the school in 1861 was 3,693 and the number of teachers employed was eighty.⁶

It was not until 1863 that the second superintendent of the schools of Detroit was elected.⁷ The president, in the report for that year, again referred to the necessity of having a superintendent of schools. The arguments advanced for the officer were the necessity for having someone who could give all of his time to the examination and selection of teachers, the grading and classification of the schools, and the rendering of the schools more efficient at the least expense.⁸ The president's report for 1864 makes the statement that because of the work which the superintendent had been able to accomplish, the Detroit schools had been put in unusually good condition.⁹

¹Ibid., p. 10.

²Reports of the Public Schools of the City of Detroit, p. 5. Detroit: School Committee, 1855.

³Moehlman, op. cit., p. 94.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Eighteenth Annual Report Presented to the Board of Education of the City of Detroit by D. Bethune Duffield, Pres., p. 45. Detroit: Board of Education, 1861.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Twentieth Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 9. Detroit: Board of Education, 1863.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Twenty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 12-13. Detroit: Board of Education, 1864.

Louisville

The first free school in Louisville was established in 1829.¹ The ordinance which gave authority for establishing the schools also gave the mayor and city council the power to appoint a board of six school trustees. The trustees were given the privilege of organizing and of electing a chairman and secretary from their own group.² This board of trustees was required to hold one stated meeting each month, to appoint a committee of their own body to visit the schools each week.³ The teachers were elected and removed by the trustees and they had general control over the school system.⁴ The board of trustees appointed by the mayor and city council drew up regulations for their own guidance and that of the affairs of the schools.⁵ The supervision of the schools was in the hands of a visiting committee for each department of the school.

The committees consisted of three members and their duties were to:

1. Visit each department twice each month.
2. Inspect the school bill.
3. Inquire into the progress of the pupils.
4. Converse with the instructors to gain information which might be used in other schools.
5. Encourage the faithful instructors.
6. Mark the delinquencies of the unfaithful instructors.
7. Give advice to instructors on conditions which trouble them.
8. Make temporary arrangements when necessary and report same to the board.
9. Report to the board at its stated meetings.⁶

In addition to the sub-committee for each school, the board each year appointed an examining committee. This committee consisted of three members and was to be joined by as many members of the board as found it convenient to do so. The examining committee was charged with the duty of examining the several departments of the schools and reporting the conditions found; the

¹An Account of the Louisville City Schools, Together with the Ordinances of the City Council, pp. 11-18. Louisville: City Council, 1830.

²Ibid., p. 15.

³Ibid., p. 11.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 15.

⁶Ibid., pp. 17-18.

report was to be made before the annual election of teachers.¹

It is evident that the mayor and council exercised some authority over the early schools in addition to appointing the board of trustees. In the minutes of the meeting of the trustees held February 21, 1835, mention is made of the fact that in conformity with the resolution of the mayor and council, all of the schools had been placed on the monitorial plan of teaching. These same minutes urge the members of the council and the parents of the children to visit the schools. In the minutes for July 17, 1835, a resolution is incorporated fixing the date for the annual examination, and stating that the mayor will distribute the medals on the day of examination.

At the meeting of the trustees held on July 7, 1837, the following resolution was passed:

"Resolved, a committee of four members of this board shall be appointed for the center school, and two committees of three members each, for each of the other schools.
Resolved, that said committees shall make report of the condition of the schools under their charge at each stated meeting of the board either verbally or in writing.
Resolved, that said committees shall serve twelve months commencing with the first of October next."

At the same meeting the following resolution was also passed:

"Resolved, that on application for the place of teacher the examination shall be made at a stated or called meeting of the Board, and that no certificate shall be issued to a candidate for the office of teachers except by a vote at one such meeting of the Board."

There is nothing in the minutes of the meetings of the board of trustees of Louisville to give the exact date of the appointment of the first superintendent of schools. On July 31, 1837, the mayor and city council appointed a board called the board of visitors and examiners. This board appointed an agent of the board, the duties of this officer were those of supervising the schools, keeping the financial records, acting as secretary of the board, and taking charge of the school property.² In 1847 the term "superintendent" was first used in speaking of the then occupant of the office created in 1837.³

¹Ibid., p. 17.

²L. H. Gregory, "History of the Superintendency of the Louisville Schools." Unpublished Manuscript, Louisville, Ky., 1928.

³Ibid.

Summary

The materials presented in this chapter give unmistakable evidence that the rapid growth of cities was responsible for the rise of complex problems of school administration. The lay school administrative organizations admitted that the new problems of management were beyond their capabilities. Consequently, the assistance of professionally trained and experienced administrators was sought and the first superintendents of schools were chosen. The period of most rapid growth in the population of early American cities was in the thirty years from 1820 to 1850. The population of eight of the thirty cities used in this study increased more than 200 per cent during the period from 1820 to 1850. The population of three of the eight cities increased more than 1,000 per cent and that of one city, Cleveland, increased more than 2,000 per cent.

In seven of the thirty cities from which annual school reports were analyzed to secure materials for this study, the first superintendent of schools was appointed before 1850. In eleven of the thirty cities he was appointed between 1850 and 1860, or during the decade immediately following 1850. The first superintendent was appointed before 1880 in all except four of the thirty cities.

Two tendencies were revealed when the size of the school enrolment and the number of teachers, at the time of the appointment of the first superintendent, were considered. Eleven of the thirty cities employed fewer than twenty-five teachers when the first superintendent was chosen. These cities apparently wanted a superintendent to aid in the establishment of the school system. Nine of the thirty cities employed fifty or more teachers when the first superintendent was chosen. These cities needed the superintendent to solve the problems of administrative control which had baffled the lay boards of education. The median number of pupils enrolled in the schools of the thirty cities at the time of the appointment of the first superintendent was 2,167. Fourteen of the cities enrolled fewer than 2,000 pupils and but four enrolled more than 10,000 pupils when the first superintendent of schools was elected.

The analysis of the organizations for the administrative control of schools in five selected cities reveals a complex and cumbersome structure. It is doubtful if any private enterprise which expended as much money as was annually expended by the public school systems at that time could have continued to function with the type of organization that was used in the schools. There was no responsible head; there was every opportunity for evading responsibility. Moreover, the lay administrative officers admitted that they had neither the time nor the training to administer the schools as schools should be administered.

CHAPTER III

POWERS AND DUTIES FIRST ASSIGNED TO THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Source of Materials for the Chapter

The materials on which this chapter is based were secured for the most part directly from the cities studied. Letters were written to the superintendents of schools in thirty-two selected cities of the United States. These letters requested the superintendents to send extracts from the minutes of the meeting of the board of education at which the superintendent of schools was first elected and his duties defined. From these and follow-up letters returns were received from twenty-seven of the thirty-two cities. City charters and the annual reports of school systems yielded material for two additional cities. Three of the cities --Dallas, Detroit, and Pittsburgh--had to be dropped from this section of the study because no records of the original duties of the superintendent could be discovered. The materials from Omaha, Portland, and Toledo were from regulations so recently enacted that they were not used in the study. The complete list of cities with the date of appointment of the first superintendent of schools is given in Table IV.

Authority Appointing the First Superintendent, Date of Appointment, Length of Term, Salary

Data on the appointment of the first superintendent of schools, terms of office, and salary are presented in Table V for the twenty-six cities whose regulations were analyzed. The board of education was the appointing authority in all except four of the cities.

In Cincinnati the first superintendent of schools was elected by popular vote.¹ In Houston the superintendent was appointed by the mayor, subject to the approval of the council.²

¹Acts of a Local Nature Passed by the Forty-Eighth General Assembly, XLVIII, 662. Columbus: Scott and Bascum State Printers.

²Charter of the City Together with a Revised Code of Ordinances, p. 109. Houston: City Council, December, 1886.

In Louisville the appointment was made by the city council,¹ the officer so appointed being called the school agent.² The board minutes of Louisville school district for March 20, 1847, made the first use of the term superintendent of schools. The choice

TABLE IV

LIST OF CITIES REQUESTED TO FURNISH INFORMATION ON DUTIES OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS WHEN THE OFFICE WAS CREATED

Cities	Dates of Appointment of First Superintendent	Cities	Dates of Appointment of First Superintendent
Louisville, Ky.....	1837	*Detroit, Mich.....	1855
Providence, R.I.....	1839	*Pittsburgh, Pa.....	1856
St. Louis, Mo.....	1839	Milwaukee, Wis.....	1859
New Orleans, La.....	1841	New Haven, Conn.....	1859
Rochester, N.Y.....	1843	Kansas City, Mo.....	1868
Columbus, Ohio.....	1847	Washington, D.C.....	1869
Baltimore, Md.....	1848	Atlanta, Ga.....	1871
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	1850	Denver, Colo.....	1871
Boston, Mass.....	1851	*Omaha, Nebr.....	1872
New York, N.Y.....	1851	Houston, Texas.....	1873
San Francisco, Calif.	1852	Minneapolis, Minn....	1873
Cleveland, Ohio.....	1853	*Portland, Oregon.....	1873
Chicago, Ill.....	1854	Seattle, Wash.....	1882
Los Angeles, Calif...	1854	Philadelphia, Pa.....	1883
Nashville, Tenn.....	1854	*Dallas, Texas.....	1888
*Toledo, Ohio.....	1854	Salt Lake City, Utah.	1888

*Cities not included in the analysis.

of the first superintendent of Los Angeles was unique. At a meeting of the city council held May 20, 1854, one of the members moved that the mayor, Stephen C. Foster, be appointed superintendent

¹Kentucky, Laws, Statutes, etc. Collection of the acts of Virginia and Kentucky relative to Louisville and Portland: with the charter of the city of Louisville and the Amendments thereto made under the direction of the Mayor and Council. Section 7, p. 157. Louisville: Prentice and Deissinger, 1839.

²Ibid., pp. 157-58.

TABLE V

AUTHORITY APPOINTING, DATE OF APPOINTMENT, TERM AND SALARY
OF THE FIRST SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS IN TWENTY-SEVEN
CITIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Cities	Authority Appointing	Date of Appoint- ment	Term	Salary
Louisville, Ky.....	City Council	1837	1 yr.	\$ 400
Providence, R.I.....	Board of Ed.	1839	1 yr.	1250
St. Louis, Mo.....	Board of Ed.	1839	1 yr.	300
New Orleans, La.....	Board of Ed.	1841	1 yr.	1500
Rochester, N.Y.....	Board of Ed.	1843	1 yr.	500
Columbus, Ohio.....	Board of Ed.	1847	1 yr.	800
Baltimore, Md.....	Board of Ed.	1848	4 yrs.	2000
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	Popular Vote	1850	1 yr.	800
Boston, Mass.....	Board of Ed.	1851	1 yr.	2500
New York, N.Y.....	Board of Ed.	1851	2 yrs.	1500
San Francisco, Calif.	Board of Ed.	1852	1 yr.	1200
Cleveland, Ohio.....	Board of Ed.	1853	1 yr.	1300
Chicago, Ill.....	School Inspectors	1854	1 yr.	1000
	Approved by Council			
Los Angeles, Calif...	City Council	1854	1 yr.	1020*
Nashville, Tenn.....	Board of Ed.	1854	1 yr.	2500
Detroit, Mich.....	Board of Ed.	1855	1 yr.	900
Milwaukee, Wis.....	Board of Ed.	1859	1 yr.	Not over 2000
New Haven, Conn.....	Board of Ed.	1859	Indef.	750
Kansas City, Mo.....	Board of Ed.	1868	10 mos.	1500
Washington, D.C.....	Board of Ed.	1869	1 yr.	2500
Atlanta, Ga.....	Board of Ed.	1871	1 yr.	2000
Denver, Colo.....	Board of Ed.	1871	1 yr.	2000
Houston, Texas.....	Appointment by Mayor, Approved by Council	1873	1 yr.	Not over 2500
Minneapolis, Minn....	Board of Ed.	1873	1 yr.	2000
Seattle, Wash.....	Board of Ed.	1882	10 mos.	1250
Philadelphia, Pa.....	Board of Ed.	1883	3 yrs.	5000
Salt Lake City, Utah.	Board of Ed.	1888	2 yrs.	2500

*First record available is for year beginning January 1,
1876.

of common schools.¹ At the same meeting three members of the city council were appointed members of the board of education.² In Chicago the appointment of the first superintendent was made by the board of school inspectors subject to approval by the common council.³

Removal from Office

The Chicago regulations provided that the superintendent might be removed at any time by a vote of the board of school inspectors and also that he might be removed by a two-thirds vote of the common council.⁴ The regulations for Milwaukee provided that the superintendent might be removed by a two-thirds vote of common council in joint convention.⁵ The superintendent, in the event that charges were preferred against him, was to have five days' notice of the hearing and the right to produce counsel and witnesses in his defense.⁶ Providence is the only other city, among those whose regulations were analyzed, in which provision is made for the removal of the superintendent. The Providence regulations specified that he might be removed from office in case of inability or mismanagement,⁷ but no mention was made of the authority for removing him.

Unusual Features in the Dates of Appointment of Some First Superintendents

There are several discrepancies between the dates of appointment of the first superintendents and the dates of the regulations pertaining to the superintendents used in this analysis. Baltimore is given credit for having had a superintendent of schools as early as 1848. At that date the treasurer of the

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education and Superintendent of City Schools with Rules and Regulations of the Public Schools of the City of Los Angeles, p. 93. Los Angeles: Board of Education, 1897.

²Ibid.

³Ordinances of the City of Chicago, compiled by Arno Voss, Corporation Counsel, pp. 60-62. Chicago: City Council, 1853.

⁴Ibid., p. 62.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners to the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, p. 81. Milwaukee: Board of School Commissioners, 1869.

⁶Ibid.

⁷"Minutes of the School Committee of Providence," May 8, 1839 (manuscript).

school district was charged with the responsibilities of supervision. In 1866 the treasurer was relieved of the duties connected with the financial administration of the school system and all of his time was devoted to the instructional interests.¹ It may be said, then, that the Baltimore school superintendency dates from 1866; the regulations governing the office were made in 1866 rather than in 1848.

The earliest available regulations governing the duties of the superintendent of the Los Angeles schools are dated 1881. The office was created in 1854, when the mayor was elected to the position of superintendent of schools.² During the twenty-seven years between 1854 and 1881 fourteen different persons held the office of superintendent of the Los Angeles schools.³ From 1854 to 1866 the common council appointed the superintendent, and from 1866 to 1870 he was elected by popular vote.⁴ In 1870 it was discovered that there was no authority for electing a superintendent, since the laws specified that the schools were to be governed by a board of trustees. In 1872 a special act of the legislature created a city board of education and gave it power to elect a superintendent of schools.⁵

The New Haven superintendency grew out of the position of acting school visitor, a position which was established in 1856.⁶ In 1858 the acting school visitor resigned his position and recommended that a superintendent of schools be appointed. The board of education appointed a committee to consider the recommendation of the acting school visitor. This committee met with the former acting school visitor and, as a result of the interview, recommended a plan of action to the board of education. The recommendation of the committee was that the former acting school visitor be appointed general superintendent of schools and that an acting superintendent of schools be appointed.⁷ The acting superintendent of schools was to work under the advice of the general

¹Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of the Public Schools, p. 54. Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1866.

²Loc. cit.

³Ibid., p. 94.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Connecticut Public Acts, 1856. Chap. xli, "An Act in Addition to and in Revision of an Act Called 'An Act of Education'." Sub-chapter 1, sec. 10 and sub-chapter 11, sec. 1.

⁷Ibid., sub-chapter 11, sec. 1.

superintendent and the board of education. The recommendation of the committee was accepted and the plan was in operation for one year. In 1860 the acting superintendent of schools was elected superintendent.

The New Orleans superintendency, created in 1841, was concurrent with the establishment of a public school system in that city.¹ The board of education elected to the position of first superintendent of schools a man who had been recommended to them by Horace Mann, then Secretary to the Board of Education of Massachusetts.² The minutes of the meeting at which this action was taken refer vaguely to some extenuating circumstances over which they had no control.³ Whether these circumstances were caused by the recommendation of secretary Mann or by some other conditions the minutes do not state.

The first superintendent of schools of St. Louis was appointed in 1839.⁴ Fifteen years later, in 1854, the first report of the superintendent of schools was issued. The earliest available regulations for the office of superintendent of schools were published in 1857.⁵ In 1847 there was published a set of regulations for the superintendents of St. Louis schools.⁶ From these regulations it is apparent that there was a so-called superintendent for each male and female elementary school and for each primary school in the city. These superintendents were appointed by the board of education and might be changed at the beginning of each quarter. This set of regulations indicates that their duties were apparently much the same as those of elementary school principals. No data are available from which the duration of the offices of the superintendents of schools could be determined. In the superintendent's annual report for the schools of St. Louis for 1854 a list of the city superintendents from 1839 to 1854 is

¹"Minutes of Board of Directors of Public Schools of the Second Municipality of New Orleans," November, 1841 (manuscript).

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴First Annual Report of the General Superintendent of the St. Louis Schools, p. 98. St. Louis: Board of School Directors, 1854.

⁵Rules for the Government of the Board of President and Directors and Regulations of the St. Louis Schools, p. 19. St. Louis: Board of Directors, 1857.

⁶Rules and Regulations for the Government of the St. Louis Public Schools Adopted at a Meeting of the Board of Education, pp. 32-35. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1847.

given.¹ This list indicates that the position of superintendent and secretary were combined from 1841 to 1849. In 1850 there was no superintendent of schools, while in 1851 and 1852 the person filling the office was designated as secretary and superintendent pro tem.² Beginning with 1852 and continuing to 1854 a separation of the offices of superintendent and secretary evidently took place.³ In 1856 the offices were again separated, and there is no further record of their being combined.⁴

Term of the Superintendent

The prevailing length of term of the first superintendents in the twenty-six cities as shown in Table V was one year. This brief term may indicate that the office was not considered to be of a great deal of importance at the time it was created. The brief term may also be due, to some extent, to the fact that the superintendent was considered to be a sort of head teacher, and teachers were elected for one-year terms. In Baltimore, where the treasurer had been filling the offices of treasurer and superintendent, the importance of the position was sensed and the term was made longer. Much the same situation existed in New Haven, since the New Haven schools had, for several years, been under the direction of an acting school visitor, and consequently the school committee realized the value of having an executive officer. The length of term of the first Philadelphia superintendent is probably accounted for by the lateness of the date, 1883, at which he was appointed. The position of superintendent of schools at that time had passed beyond the experimental stage.

Salary of First Superintendents

The salaries of the first superintendents ranged from \$300 to \$5000, the average being \$1610 and the median \$1500. If the salary of the Philadelphia superintendent (\$5000) is omitted from the computation, the average salary of the remaining positions is \$1480.

¹Loc. cit.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

Duties and Responsibilities of the Office of Superintendent
of Schools When the Position Was Created

A detailed analysis of the regulations governing the duties and responsibilities of the superintendent of schools in the twenty-six cities reveals eleven general groups of duties and responsibilities. The extent to which one of these groups was specified by the twenty-six cities is shown in Table VI.

Act Under Direction of Board

Eleven of the twenty-six sets of regulations analyzed specifically indicated that the superintendent of schools should act under the direction or authority of the board of education. This, it would seem, may be interpreted to mean that the board of education was the power to which the superintendent was responsible and accountable. In three of the cities studied -- Atlanta,¹ Nashville,² and San Francisco³ -- the superintendent of schools was designated the executive officer of the board of education. In this connection it is interesting to note that in the original committee report defining the duties of the superintendent of schools of Cincinnati, provision was made for him to be the executive officer of the school government.⁴ In the discussion which accompanied the adoption of the regulations by the board of education the provision was eliminated.

Three cities -- Chicago,⁵ Louisville,⁶ and Milwaukee⁷ -- specified that the superintendent should act as secretary of the board of education. The Chicago and Milwaukee regulations provided that he should be the custodian of all papers and records belonging to the board of education or its committees.

¹Rules and Regulations of the Atlanta Board of Education, pp. 48-49. Atlanta: Board of Education, 1872.

²Plan of the Schools and Rules for Their Government Set Forth by the Board of Education and Approved by the City Council, pp. 94-96. Nashville: Board of Education, 1874.

³Manual of the Board of Education, pp. 14-15. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1860.

⁴"Minutes of Trustees and Visitors of the Common Schools of Cincinnati," April 24, 1850 (manuscript).

⁵Op. cit., p. 61.

⁶Op. cit., pp. 157-58.

⁷Loc. cit.

TABLE VI
RESPONSIBILITIES OF FIRST SUPERINTENDENTS TO THE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

Cities	Act under Direction of Board	Act as Ex-Officer of Board	Act as Secretary of Board	Attend Meetings of Board	Enforce Regulations	Accept Additional Duties	Advise Board
Atlanta, Ga.....	X	X	...	...	X	...	...
Baltimore, Md.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Boston, Mass.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	X
Chicago, Ill.....	X	...	X	X	...	X	...
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	...	...	...	...	...	X	...
Cleveland, Ohio.....	X	...	...	...	X	...	...
Columbus, Ohio.....	X	...	...	...	...	...	...
Denver, Colo.....	X	...	...	...	...	...	...
Houston, Texas.....	...	...	...	X	X	...	...
Kansas City, Mo.....	...	...	...	X	...	...	...
Los Angeles, Calif....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Louisville, Ky.....	X	...	...	...	X	...	...
Milwaukee, Wis.....	...	...	X	...	...	...	X
Minneapolis, Minn....	...	...	X	X	...	...	...
Nashville, Tenn.....	X	...	X	X	...	X	...
New Haven, Conn.....	X	...	...	X	...	...	...
New Orleans, La.....	...	...	...	...	X	...	...
New York, N.Y.....	...	...	...	...	X	...	...
Philadelphia, Pa.....	X	...	...	...	...	...	X
Providence, R.I.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	X
Rochester, N.Y.....	X	...	...	...	X	...	...
St. Louis, Mo.....	X	...	...	...	...	...	X
Salt Lake City, Utah..	...	...	...	...	...	...	X
San Francisco, Calif..	...	...	...	X	X	X	X
Seattle, Wash.....	...	X	...	X	...	...	...
Washington, D.C.....	...	...	...	...	X	...	X
	...	...	...	X	X	...	X

The regulations of eleven cities made mention of the attendance of the superintendent at the meetings of the board of education. In one city, Washington, the regulations specified that he might attend the meetings of the board.¹ When he attended, the superintendent was accorded the privilege of speaking on all questions. Another section of the Washington regulations provided that the superintendent should preside at all meetings in the absence of the mayor and vote on all questions coming before the board.² The Philadelphia regulations required the superintendent to attend the meetings of the board except those at which the election of the superintendent was being considered.³ The Nashville regulations specified that the superintendent should attend when requested.⁴ In the eight other cities -- Chicago,⁵ Denver,⁶ Houston,⁷ Louisville,⁸ Milwaukee,⁹ Minneapolis,¹⁰ St. Louis,¹¹ and Salt Lake City¹² -- the specification was that the superintendent should attend the meetings of the board of education. Three cities -- Atlanta,¹³ Kansas City,¹⁴ and Los Angeles¹⁵ -- while not mentioning the attendance of the superintendent at meetings of the board, specified that he should make monthly report to the board. Since no mention was made that these reports were to be in writing, it may be assumed that he made an oral report and

¹Annual Public School Report, Acts of City Councils, p. 149. Washington: Board of Education, 1871.

²Ibid.

³By-Laws of the Board of Education, pp. 286-91. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1882.

⁴Op. cit., p. 94.

⁵Op. cit., p. 61.

⁶Rules of the Board of Education, pp. 9-11. Denver: Board of Education, 1873.

⁷Charter of the City of Houston, p. 109, chap. xviii. Houston: City Council, 1886.

⁸Loc. cit.

⁹Loc. cit.

¹⁰Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 87. Minneapolis: Board of Education, 1874.

¹¹Loc. cit.

¹²Duties of the Superintendent, Consolidation of Schools, pp. 3-5. Salt Lake City: Board of Education, 1891.

¹³Op. cit., p. 48.

¹⁴"Minutes of Board of Directors of School District of Kansas City," July 7, 1868 (manuscript).

¹⁵Op. cit., p. 24.

attended the board meeting for that purpose. None of the regulations in the cities studied specified that the superintendent should not attend meetings of the board of education.

In eleven of the twenty-six cities the regulations included a provision giving the superintendent the responsibility for enforcing the rules of the board of education. In two of the cities -- Philadelphia¹ and Seattle² -- provision was made for him to report all violations of the rules and regulations which he deemed of sufficient magnitude to be serious.

Five of the cities -- Boston,³ Chicago,⁴ Cincinnati,⁵ Milwaukee,⁶ St. Louis⁷ -- indicated that the superintendent might expect to be assigned duties not already listed among the prescribed regulations. The purpose of this regulation evidently was to guard against misunderstandings over requests to perform duties which were not among those listed in the general rules and regulations.

The stipulation that the superintendent should give advice to the board had many variations. In Chicago⁸ the regulations provided that he keep the board informed of the changes required in the schools. Los Angeles⁹ required him to report such matters as might be deemed of importance to the board. The New Haven¹⁰ superintendent was expected to make suggestions and recommendations that would promote the efficiency and usefulness of the school system. In the New Orleans¹¹ regulations, the system being newly organized, the superintendent was to assist in launching a system of schools.

The New York regulations provided that the superintendent should advise and counsel with the trustees regarding the condi-

¹Op. cit., p. 286.

²"Minutes of Regular Meeting of the Board of School Directors of District Number One, Seattle," October 26, 1882 (manuscript).

³First Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, pp. 24-25. Boston: School Committee, 1852.

⁴Op. cit., p. 61.

⁵"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

⁶Loc. cit.

⁷Loc. cit.

⁸Op. cit., p. 61.

⁹Op. cit., p. 25.

¹⁰Op. cit., sub-chapter ii, sec. 1.

¹¹"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

tion of the schools.¹ The Providence² regulations enjoined the superintendent to aid the school committee in the performance of their duties. In Nashville,³ Rochester,⁴ St. Louis,⁵ and Seattle⁶ the regulations specified that the superintendent was to suggest means of improving the schools. The San Francisco⁷ regulations made it the duty of the superintendent of schools to advise the board of education as to the best mode of discipline and instruction. The Washington⁸ superintendent was expected to assist in establishing a uniform system of instruction.

Superintendents' Responsibilities to Committees
of the Board of Education

Provision was made in the regulations of six of the twenty-six cities to have the superintendent of schools give aid to committees of the board of education. In five cities -- Boston,⁹ Nashville,¹⁰ Philadelphia,¹¹ Providence,¹² and San Francisco¹³ -- the aid which was to be given was provided for in the general statement that the superintendent of schools was to assist the committees of the board of education when requested to do so. The Milwaukee¹⁴ regulations made a specific provision for the superintendent's aid to committees; he was to file all papers and records of the committees of the board.

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, pp. 29-30. New York: Board of Education, 1855.

²"Minutes of School Committee," op. cit.

³Op. cit., p. 95.

⁴By-Laws of Board of Education and Regulations of the Public Schools of the City of Rochester, pp. 18-21. Rochester: Board of Education, 1851.

⁵Op. cit., p. 19.

⁶"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

⁷Op. cit., p. 14.

⁸Op. cit., p. 190.

⁹Op. cit., p. 25.

¹⁰Op. cit., p. 94.

¹¹Op. cit., p. 287.

¹²"Minutes of School Committee of Providence," March 20, 1840 (manuscript).

¹³Op. cit., p. 14.

¹⁴Loc. cit.

Five of the twenty-six cities -- Minneapolis,¹ Nashville,² Philadelphia,³ St. Louis,⁴ and Salt Lake City⁵ -- provided in their regulations that the superintendent was to attend meetings of committees of the board of education. In Nashville, St. Louis, and Salt Lake City he was to attend when requested, but no mention was made as to who should request his presence. In Philadelphia he was to attend committee meetings at the request of the chairman of committees. The Minneapolis⁶ regulations provided that the superintendent was to attend standing committee meetings when it was necessary for him to do so.

Superintendents' Responsibilities for the Financial Administration

The responsibilities of the early superintendents for the administration of the finances of the school districts was limited. Financial responsibilities were mentioned but nine times in the regulations for the twenty-six cities.

Two of the twenty-six cities required the superintendent of schools to make a quarterly financial report. In Louisville,⁷ where the official was designated as the school agent, the regulations provided that the agent make a quarterly settlement of his accounts with the council. In making such settlement, it was added that each charge was to be sustained by a proper voucher. The San Francisco⁸ regulations provided that the superintendent make a quarterly report showing the financial condition, the expenditures, and the amount of school funds in the treasury. The San Francisco⁹ regulations provided that the superintendent make such financial recommendations as he deemed necessary. The Boston¹⁰ regulations gave to the superintendent the responsibility of suggesting means of reducing the expenses of the schools, providing such reduction did not interfere with efficiency. The superintendent of the Nashville¹¹ schools was expected to recommend, after

¹Loc. cit.

²Op. cit., p. 94.

³Op. cit., p. 287.

⁴Op. cit., p. 19.

⁵Op. cit., p. 4.

⁶Loc. cit.

⁷Op. cit., pp. 157-58.

⁸Op. cit., p. 15.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Op. cit., p. 25.

¹¹Op. cit., p. 94.

a survey, such changes in the boundaries of the school districts as would lessen the expenses of maintaining the schools. In only one city among those whose regulations were analyzed was the superintendent given authority to execute contracts for work, materials, or leases. San Francisco¹ made this provision and provided further that the contracts were to be let only at the direction of the board of education. The board direction was not valid unless expressed by a ye and nay vote. The final directions to execute the contract were to come from the committee to which the business had been referred. As an additional safeguard, the regulations provided that all contracts not issued in accordance with the regulations were invalid.

The superintendent of the Milwaukee² schools was a member of the finance committee of the board of education. This committee was charged with the duty of auditing all accounts and certifying them to the board for payment. The Rochester³ regulations required the superintendent to make out all bills for the contingent expenses of the schools. This responsibility was under the direction of the finance committee of the board, and the committee would allow no bills for contingent expenses unless they were approved by the superintendent. In Louisville⁴ the superintendent, or school agent, was required to keep a separate expense account of each school. This account was always to be open to the inspection of the board of education and the city council.

Superintendents' Responsibilities for the School Plant

Table VII shows the superintendents' responsibilities for the school plant. The first superintendents were given very little authority for the school plant. Four cities indicated, in their regulations governing the duties of their first superintendent of schools, that that officer should assist in planning new school buildings and in altering existing buildings. The Boston⁵ regulations provided that he should give aid with a view toward insuring more uniformity and economy in building construction. In New Orleans,⁶ the members of the board of education felt that they needed the advice of the superintendent in erecting the school

¹Op. cit., p. 14.

²Loc. cit.

³Op. cit., p. 19.

⁴Op. cit., pp. 157-58.

⁵Op. cit., p. 25.

⁶"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

TABLE VII
RESPONSIBILITIES OF FIRST SUPERINTENDENTS
FOR THE SCHOOL PLANT

Cities	Aid in Plan- ning New Build- ings	Notify Board or Com- mittee of Needed Repairs	Superin- tend Schools, School- houses, Apparatus	Issue Pro- posals for Furnish- ing Fuel	Prohibit School Buildings Being Used for Other Purposes
Atlanta.....	...	...	...	...	...
Baltimore.....	...	...	...	...	...
Boston.....	X	...	...	...	...
Chicago.....	...	...	X	...	...
Cincinnati....	...	...	...	...	...
Cleveland.....	...	...	...	...	...
Columbus.....	...	...	X	...	...
Denver.....	...	...	X	...	...
Houston.....	...	...	X	...	...
Kansas City...	...	...	...	...	...
Los Angeles...	...	X	X	...	...
Louisville....	...	X	X	X	...
Milwaukee.....	...	...	...	...	...
Minneapolis...	...	...	...	...	...
Nashville.....	...	...	...	...	...
New Haven.....	...	...	...	...	...
New Orleans...	X	...	...	...	...
New York.....	...	X	...	...	...
Philadelphia..	...	X	...	...	...
Providence....	...	...	X	...	...
Rochester.....	...	...	X	X	...
St. Louis.....	...	X	...	...	X
Salt Lake City	X	...	...	...	...
San Francisco.	X	...	...	...	...
Seattle.....	...	...	...	...	...
Washington....	...	X	X	...	...

buildings. In Salt Lake City¹ he was expected to give any information he had which would help to insure that the school buildings would be most economically built, convenient, and healthful. It was the duty of the San Francisco² superintendent to suggest to the committee on schoolhouses and sites necessary or economical plans for buildings and alterations.

In the matter of repairs to existing buildings six cities gave responsibility to the superintendent. In Los Angeles³ he was directed to inform the board of all needed repairs. The school agent in Louisville⁴ was directed to keep the buildings and their enclosures in repair. The superintendent of the New York⁵ schools was expected to inquire into the condition of the schoolhouses.

It was made the duty of the Philadelphia⁶ superintendent to report defects in the sanitary conditions, heating or ventilating systems of the schoolhouses. The St. Louis⁷ regulations stipulated that the superintendent should notify the board of education of all needed repairs. The Washington⁸ regulations specified that neither the superintendent nor the board of trustees were empowered to spend more than fifty dollars on the alterations of any school building without the written authority of the mayor or an act of the councils.

Nine of the twenty-six cities -- Chicago,⁹ Columbus,¹⁰ Denver,¹¹ Houston,¹² Los Angeles,¹³ Louisville,¹⁴ Providence,¹⁵ Rochester,¹⁶ and Washington¹⁷ -- directed the superintendent to "superintend" the schools, schoolhouses, and apparatus. The

¹Op. cit., p. 3.

²Op. cit., p. 14.

³Op. cit., p. 25

⁴Op. cit., pp. 157-58.

⁵Loc. cit.

⁶Op. cit., p. 287.

⁷Op. cit., p. 19.

⁸Loc. cit.

⁹Op. cit., p. 60.

¹⁰By-Laws of the Board of Education and Rules for the Government of the Public Schools, p. 14. Columbus: Board of Education, 1848.

¹¹Op. cit., p. 7.

¹²Loc. cit.

¹³Op. cit., p. 24.

¹⁴Op. cit., pp. 157-58.

¹⁵"Minutes of School Committee," op. cit.

¹⁶Op. cit., p. 20.

¹⁷Loc. cit.

provision is both general and vague. The inference that may be drawn is that he was to be responsible, in a general way, for the entire school system; the real meaning, however, is not obvious. In connection with the provision that the superintendent was to "superintend" the schools, schoolhouses, and apparatus, it is interesting to discover that only one city out of the twenty-six indicated that he had any responsibility for the janitorial service. San Francisco¹ gave him the duty of aiding the committee on schoolhouses and sites to supervise and regulate the janitorial department. The San Francisco regulations made no mention of any responsibility on the part of the superintendent in connection with the superintendence of school buildings, schools, and apparatus.

Two cities, Louisville,² and Rochester,³ gave the superintendent a responsibility in connection with furnishing fuel for the schools. The Louisville regulations stated that "the agent" should provide fuel and furniture under the direction of the council. The Rochester superintendent was directed to issue proposals to furnish and contract for fuel under the direction of the committee on finance. Only one city, St. Louis,⁴ directed the superintendent to prohibit the school buildings from being used for purposes other than those connected with the schools.

Superintendents' Responsibilities for Reports

Annual reports.-- Twenty of the twenty-six cities required their superintendents to make annual reports. Considerable variance, both in the time when the report was to be submitted and in its required content, can be observed. The specific practices of each of the twenty cities is shown in Table IX. Two common tendencies may be noted in the regulations governing the submission of annual reports by superintendents of schools: (1) Fourteen of the cities required the report to be submitted at the close of the school year. (2) Eleven of the twenty cities specified that the superintendent should make, in his annual report, suggestions for the improvement of the schools. Only four of the cities -- Atlanta, Baltimore, St. Louis and Salt Lake City -- failed to indicate any requirements as to the content of the annual report. One city, New York, stated that the superintendent should submit such information as was requested.⁵

¹Op. cit., p. 14.

²Op. cit., pp. 157-58.

³Op. cit., p. 19.

⁴Op. cit., p. 19.

⁵Op. cit., p. 29.

TABLE VIII

RESPONSIBILITIES OF FIRST SUPERINTENDENTS FOR REPORTS

Cities	Make an Annual Report	Make a Quarterly Report	Make a Monthly Report	Make Additional Reports at Request of Board
Atlanta.....	X	X	X	X
Baltimore.....	X	...	X	...
Boston.....	X	...	...	...
Chicago.....	X	...	...	X
Cincinnati.....	...	X	...	...
Cleveland.....	X	X	...	...
Columbus.....	X	X	...	X
Denver.....	X	...	X	X
Houston.....	...	...	...	...
Kansas City.....	X	...	X	...
Los Angeles.....	X	...	X	...
Louisville.....	X	X	...	...
Milwaukee.....	...	...	...	...
Minneapolis.....	X	...	...	...
Nashville.....	X	...	X	...
New Haven.....	X	...	...	...
New Orleans.....	...	...	...	...
New York.....	X	...	X	...
Philadelphia.....	X	...	...	...
Providence.....	X	X	...	...
Rochester.....	X	X	...	...
St. Louis.....	X	X	...	X
Salt Lake City.....	X	X	...	X
San Francisco.....	...	X	...	...
Seattle.....	X	...	...	X
Washington.....	...	...	X	...

TABLE IX
DATE OF SUBMITTANCE AND REQUIRED CONTENT OF ANNUAL REPORTS BY FIRST SUPERINTENDENTS

Cities	Date of Report		Required Content of Report
	As soon as possible after close of school year	Not specified	
Atlanta.....	At close of school year	Not specified	
Baltimore.....	During the month of December	Conditions of schools Suggestions for improvements	
Boston.....	Close of school year	Condition of schools and changes required	
Chicago.....	Close of school year	Abstract of teachers' statistical reports, suggestions and other information	
Cleveland.....	Close of school year	Abstract of teachers' reports Account of labors of superintendent Suggestions for improvement	
Columbus.....	Close of school year	Condition of schools Suggestions and recommendations	
Denver.....	Close of school year	Such statistics and history as may be required under the state law	
Kansas City...	Last regular meeting in July	General view of the schools Recommendation of measures for improving the schools	
Los Angeles...	As soon as possible after close of school year	Condition of each school Detailed financial report Estimates of expense for the next year	
Louisville....	On or before the first of March	Abstracts of principals' reports Report of labors of Superintendent Suggestions for improvement	
Minneapolis...	Close of school year	Abstract of teachers' yearly reports Report of labors of Superintendent Suggestions for improvement	
Nashville.....	Close of school year	Condition of schools Suggestions to improve efficiency of the school system	
New Haven.....	Before annual meeting of school district		

TABLE IX (Continued)

Cities	Date of Report	Required Content of Report
New York.....	As the state superintendent required	Whole number of schools Such other information as requested
Philadelphia..	In the month of March	Account of duties as superintendent Facts of importance Recommendations for increasing the efficiency of the school
Providence....	Close of school year	Condition of schools
Rochester.....	First Monday in March	Operation of schools Condition and prospects State of education in city generally
St. Louis.....	As soon as possible after close of school year	Not specified
Salt Lake City	First Monday in July	Not specified
Seattle	Close of school year	Condition and progress of schools Recommendations for improvement of the schools

Quarterly reports.- In ten cities the superintendent was required to submit a quarterly report. Two of the cities requiring quarterly reports, Cincinnati and San Francisco, did not require an annual report. In the other eight cities calling for a quarterly report, an annual report was also required. Six cities -- Atlanta,¹ Providence,² Rochester,³ St. Louis,⁴ Salt Lake City,⁵ and San Francisco⁶ -- indicated that the superintendent was to make recommendations in his quarterly report for the improvement of the schools. Two cities, Atlanta⁷ and Salt Lake City,⁸ asked for such vague information as, "conditions and prospects of the schools," and "conditions and progress of the schools." San Francisco required the superintendent to submit the expenditures and balances in the several budget classifications in his quarterly report.⁹

Monthly reports.- Eight cities required the superintendent to submit a monthly report to the board of education. Washington is the only city in which the monthly report was the only report required.¹⁰ Atlanta asked the superintendent to submit annual, quarterly, and monthly reports.¹¹ The required content of the monthly report varied rather widely. Three cities -- Atlanta,¹² Nashville,¹³ and Kansas City¹⁴ -- asked for information on the punctuality of the teaching staff. Three cities -- Baltimore,¹⁵ New York,¹⁶ and Washington¹⁷ -- expected the superintendent to give in his monthly report an accounting of the visitations he had made to the schools during the month. One city, Denver, gave the superintendent the vague injunction to report on "the progress of the schools."¹⁸

¹Op. cit., p. 49.

²"Minutes of School Committee," op. cit.

³Op. cit., p. 20.

⁴Op. cit., p. 19.

⁵Op. cit., p. 3.

⁶Op. cit., p. 15.

⁷Op. cit., p. 49.

⁸Op. cit., p. 3.

⁹Op. cit., p. 15.

¹⁰Loc. cit.

¹¹Op. cit., p. 49.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Op. cit., p. 96.

¹⁴"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

¹⁵Op. cit., p. 57.

¹⁶Op. cit., p. 29.

¹⁷Loc. cit.

¹⁸Op. cit., p. 40.

Reports on request.- In addition to the annual, quarterly, or monthly reports, seven cities specified that the superintendent should make reports when required to do so by the board of education. The regulations were vague in mentioning the content of these special reports. This is probably to be expected since called reports would deal largely with emergency situations and conditions. Four of the seven cities -- Atlanta,¹ St. Louis,² Salt Lake City,³ and Seattle⁴ -- asked for such indefinite information as "the condition and progress of the schools." The specifications of the Denver report are much more sensible for a called report. The Denver regulations indicated that the report was to be made on "such matters as are required."⁵ The called report of the Chicago superintendent was to deal with by-laws and regulations for the government, discipline, and management of the schools.⁶

Cities requiring no reports.- Three cities -- Houston,⁷ Kansas City,⁸ and New Orleans⁹ -- made no reference in the regulations to the superintendents' responsibilities for reporting to the board of education. It is to be expected that he made reports and that the duty was, without doubt, a part of the later regulations.

Superintendents' Responsibilities for the Teaching Staff

Table X reveals the nature and extent of the responsibilities which the superintendents exercised over the teaching staffs of the school systems.

Assist in examining applicants for teaching positions.- Eleven cities expected the superintendent to render assistance in examining applicants for teaching positions. In only two cities, New Haven¹⁰ and New York,¹¹ was he entrusted with the sole responsibility for examining the applicants for teaching positions.

¹Op. cit., p. 49.

²Op. cit., p. 19.

³Op. cit., p. 3.

⁴"Minutes of the Board of Directors," op. cit.

⁵Op. cit., p. 40.

⁶Op. cit., p. 61.

⁷Loc. cit.

⁸"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

⁹"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

¹⁰Op. cit., sub-chapter 11, sec. 1.

¹¹Op. cit., p. 29.

TABLE X
RESPONSIBILITIES OF FIRST SUPERINTENDENTS FOR TEACHING STAFF

Cities	Assist in Examining Applicants for Teaching Positions	Conduct Teachers' Meetings	Fill Temporary Vacancies	Report Incompetent Teachers to Board	Assist in Establishing a Normal Class or School	Recommend Teachers for Election
Atlanta.....	X	...	...	...	X	...
Baltimore.....	...	...	...	...	...	...
Boston.....	...	...	...	...	...	...
Chicago.....	...	...	...	X	...	...
Cincinnati.....	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cleveland.....	...	X	X	...	...	...
Columbus.....	...	X	X	...	...	...
Denver.....	X	X	X	X	...	...
Houston.....	...	X	...	...	...	X
Kansas City.....	...	...	...	...	...	...
Los Angeles.....	...	X	X	X	...	...
Louisville.....	...	...	...	...	...	...
Milwaukee.....	X	...	...	...	...	...
Minneapolis.....	...	X	X	...	...	X
Nashville.....	X	X	X	X	X	...
New Haven.....	X	X	...	...	...	...
New Orleans.....	...	...	...	...	...	...
New York.....	X	...	...	...	...	...
Philadelphia.....	...	X	...	...	X	...
Providence.....	...	...	...	...	...	...
Rochester.....	X	X	X	...	...	...
St. Louis.....	X	...	...	...	...	...
Salt Lake City...	X	X	X	X	...	...
San Francisco...	X	...	...	...	X	X
Seattle.....	...	X	...	X	...	...
Washington.....	X	X	...	X	...	...

In one city, Atlanta,¹ the superintendent was directed to keep a register of the applicants and to send the registrants a notice of the time and place of the examination. The superintendent of San Francisco was an ex officio member of the committee on the examination of teachers.² In the remaining cities the superintendent was expected to assist a committee of the board of education to conduct the examinations. Boards of education were apparently reluctant to permit the privilege of determining eligibility for teaching to be removed from their jurisdiction. This was a privilege and a responsibility loaded with vast political possibilities.

Conduct teachers' meetings.- The superintendents were given a free hand in the conduct of teachers' meetings, the time and frequency of holding the meetings being left in most cities to their discretion. The purpose for which the meetings were to be held was uniformly the same -- the improvement of classroom instruction. In only a few regulations was any mention made of interchange of views or discussion of teaching problems. The accepted method seemed to be that of telling teachers what to do and how it should be done.

Fill temporary vacancies.- Eight cities gave the superintendent restricted permission to fill temporary vacancies in the teaching staff. In Cleveland,³ Los Angeles,⁴ Minneapolis,⁵ and Salt Lake City,⁶ he was empowered to fill the vacancy and report his action at the first subsequent meeting of the board. In Columbus,⁷ Nashville,⁸ and Rochester⁹ he was not permitted to fill temporary vacancies until he had secured the consent of the board or of one of its committees. The regulations for Denver stated that the superintendent was to fill vacancies in case of temporary absence of teachers.¹⁰ This is the only instance, among the eight cities, in which the superintendent was given what seemed to be real authority and responsibility.

Report incompetent teachers.- The regulations in nine cities directed the superintendent to report incompetent teachers

¹Op. cit., p. 48.

²Op. cit., p. 14.

³Annual Report of Board of Education, School Rules and Regulations, p. 4. Cleveland: Board of Education, 1854.

⁴Op. cit., p. 25.

⁵Loc. cit.

⁶Op. cit., p. 5.

⁷Op. cit., p. 13.

⁸Op. cit., p. 95.

⁹Op. cit., p. 21.

¹⁰Op. cit., p. 40.

to the board of education, but he had no final authority in the matter. However, that was to be expected since the board of education was the authority responsible for the hiring of teachers. Milwaukee¹ gave the superintendent the right to dismiss teachers for incompetency if the board of education concurred. Nashville empowered him to suspend incompetent teachers.² Such action was to be communicated to the board of education in a written report. In the other seven cities the regulations specified that the superintendent was to report teachers considered inefficient to the board or to a committee of the board. A singular fact in this connection is the lack of a regulation asking for a report on competent teachers. A stipulation that efficiency in the school-room was to be recognized to at least the same extent as inefficiency, might have served as a stimulus to the teaching staff.

Assist in teacher education.- Four cities -- Atlanta,³ Nashville,⁴ Philadelphia,⁵ and San Francisco,⁶ made provision in their regulations for the superintendent to assist in the education of teachers. The Atlanta regulations provided that he was to be the principal of the normal class. The superintendent of the Nashville schools was expected to organize the corps of teachers into a normal class to meet as often as the board of education thought advisable. The sessions were to be two hours in length and were to be devoted to a discussion of the branches taught in the schools together with the best methods of teaching them. Teachers in the Nashville schools who failed or refused to attend and participate in the sessions were to be reported to the board of education. The superintendent of the Philadelphia schools was expected to visit the Girls' Normal School. He was directed to confer with the principal of the school, the principal of the department of practice, and the teacher of methods. In these conferences it was expected that he would make suggestions for the improvement of the work and products of the schools. In San Francisco the regulations provided that the superintendent of schools should be an ex officio member of the committee on the normal school.

Recommend teachers for election.- Only two cities out of the twenty-six, Denver⁷ and Minneapolis,⁸ gave to the superintendent

¹Loc. cit.

²Op. cit., p. 95.

³Op. cit., p. 48.

⁴Op. cit., p. 95.

⁵Op. cit., p. 286.

⁶Op. cit., p. 14.

⁷Op. cit., p. 40.

⁸Loc. cit.

of schools the privilege of recommending teachers for election. In Denver he was required to report to the board of education two weeks before the close of the school year, giving an estimate of the qualifications of the teachers and making recommendations. The superintendent of Minneapolis was responsible for recommending teachers to the board of education previous to their election.

Superintendents' Responsibilities for Instruction

The early superintendents were chosen to take over many of the responsibilities for the instruction program of the schools. Instruction was the phase of school management which the lay boards of education felt incompetent to direct, and which required the board members to devote more time than their business interests permitted. Table XI shows the responsibilities for instruction assigned to the first superintendents.

Supervise the schools.-- Twenty-five of the twenty-six cities directed the superintendent to supervise the schools. No other single responsibility is mentioned so frequently in the regulations as this one. Boards of education apparently realized their limitations in the matter of the supervision of the work of the schools. The regulations carried no specific suggestions for the organization of the program of supervision. The directions were given in general terms; the specific suggestions were evidently left to the discretion of the superintendent. In four cities -- Milwaukee,¹ Rochester,² San Francisco,³ and Washington⁴-- the regulations indicated that the superintendent was to assist or work under the direction of the board of education in supervising the schools. The Chicago regulations specified that he was to "endeavor to transfer improvements and remedy defects."⁵ This provision seems to indicate that the superintendent was expected to make the good teaching of the schools the criterion for all the teachers.

Visit the schools.-- This responsibility ranks second in frequency of mention among the duties assigned to the first superintendents. Twenty-two cities included this responsibility in the original list of duties assigned to the office. Sixteen of the cities directed the superintendent to visit the schools as frequently as he found it possible to do so. Three cities --

¹Loc. cit.

²Op. cit., p. 20.

³Op. cit., p. 144.

⁴Loc. cit.

⁵Op. cit., p. 61.

TABLE XI
RESPONSIBILITIES OF FIRST SUPERINTENDENTS FOR INSTRUCTION

Cities	Supervise the Schools	Visit the Schools	Guard Classifi- cation of Pupils	Assist in Selection of Books	Cause Course of Study to Be Followed	Aid Teachers in Discipline	Provide Books for Indigent Pupils
Atlanta.....	X	X	..	..	..	X	..
Baltimore.....	X	X	X	..	X	..	..
Boston.....	X	X	..	..	..	..	..
Chicago.....	X	X	X	..	X	X	..
Cincinnati.....	X	X	X	X	X	..	..
Cleveland.....	X	X	X	..	..	X	..
Columbus.....	X	X	X	..	X	X	..
Denver.....	X	X	X	..	X	X	..
Houston.....	X	..	..	X	..	..	..
Kansas City.....	X	X	..	..	..	..	..
Los Angeles.....	X	X	X	..	X	X	..
Louisville.....	X	X	..	..	..	..	X
Milwaukee.....	X	X	X	..	..	..	..
Minneapolis.....	X	X	..	..	..	..	..
Nashville.....	X	X	..	..	..	X	X
New Haven.....	X	X	..	..	..	X	..
New Orleans.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
New York.....	X	X	..	X	X	..	..
Philadelphia.....	X	X	..	X	X	..	..
Providence.....	X	..	X	..	X	X	X
Rochester.....	X	X	X	..	X	X	..
St. Louis.....	X	X	..	..	..	..	..
Salt Lake City.....	X	X	X	..	X	X	..
San Francisco.....	X	..	..	..	..	X	..
Seattle.....	X	X	..	X	..	X	..
Washington.....	X	X	X	X	X	X	..

Baltimore,¹ Milwaukee,² and New York³ -- indicated that he was to visit or inspect the schools. No mention was made as to the number and frequency of his visits. Atlanta⁴ specified that each school was to be visited at least once in every two weeks. Cincinnati expected a daily visit to one or more of the district schools.⁵ Rochester ordered a visit to each school at least once in each month and as much oftener as possible.⁶

Guard classification of pupils.- The problem of establishing a graded system of schools was one with which boards of education could not cope. Despite this fact, only twelve of the twenty-six cities directed the first superintendent to assume responsibility for better grading of the schools. It may be possible that the boards of education did not realize that the problem existed. Eight of the twelve cities charged the superintendent to see that the existing system of classification of the schools was carried out. Baltimore directed him to prepare a plan for the more thorough classification of the schools.⁷ Cleveland⁸ and Columbus⁹ urged the superintendent to aid the teachers in the proper classification of the pupils. One city, Milwaukee, expected the superintendent to have supervision over the manner of grading the schools.¹⁰

Assist in selection of books.- The selection of textbooks was not a serious problem in the early days of public school systems. The textbooks were not yet furnished by the school districts and the limited supply of books did not call for much skill in selection. Eight cities mentioned a responsibility of the superintendent in connection with the textbooks used in the schools. New Haven,¹¹ San Francisco,¹² and Washington¹³ expected him to recommend textbooks to the board or to a committee of the board. Houston apparently gave the superintendent the responsibility for

¹Op. cit., p. 6.

²Loc. cit.

³Op. cit., p. 29.

⁴Op. cit., p. 48.

⁵"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

⁶Op. cit., p. 19.

⁷Op. cit., p. 6.

⁸Loc. cit.

⁹Op. cit., p. 13.

¹⁰Loc. cit.

¹¹Op. cit., sub-chapter 11, sec. 1.

¹²Op. cit., p. 14.

¹³Loc. cit.

determining what textbooks should be used.¹ In Philadelphia the regulations specified that he should have no pecuniary interest in any textbooks or supplies used in the schools.² Cincinnati directed the superintendent to see that there was uniformity in the textbooks used.³

Cause course of study to be followed.- Apparently the early superintendents were not expected to construct courses of study for the schools. One half of the twenty-six cities mentioned the course of study in the list of responsibilities assigned to the first superintendent. The Washington regulations specified that he should "direct all matter relating to the course of study."⁴ If that statement meant that the construction of the course of study was the responsibility of the superintendent, Washington was the only city making such an assignment. In the other twelve cities the regulations charged the superintendents to see that the existing course of study was carried out. The New York regulations directed the superintendent to "inquire into all matters relating to the course of study."⁵

Aid teachers in discipline.- Sixteen cities made the proper discipline of the schools one of the duties and responsibilities of the first superintendent. The regulations did not indicate any method of procedure for him to follow in enforcing disciplinary measures. Evidently he was expected to be able to cope with the situations as they arose. The phrasing of the assignment to enforce discipline was much the same in all of the cities. The superintendent was enjoined to acquaint himself with the mode of discipline used in the schools and to assist the teachers in the enforcement of discipline.

Provide books for indigent pupils.- Three cities -- Louisville,⁶ Nashville,⁷ and Providence⁸ -- gave to the superintendent the responsibility for providing books for indigent pupils. Experience had evidently taught the boards of education that unless books were furnished at public expense, such pupils would be without texts.

¹Loc. cit.

²Op. cit., p. 290.

³"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

⁴Loc. cit.

⁵Op. cit., p. 29.

⁶Op. cit., pp. 157-58.

⁷Op. cit., p. 95.

⁸"Minutes of School Committee," op. cit.

Superintendents' Responsibilities for
Pupil Personnel

Managing the pupil personnel became a complex task as city school systems increased in size. Many of the duties connected with the control of the pupils in the schools required constant attention. The superintendent of schools, who devoted full time to the duties of his office, was the best person to entrust with the responsibilities for the pupil personnel. The boards of education, however, did not in most cases give all of the responsibilities to the new superintendent. Table XII shows the distribution of the early superintendents' responsibilities for the pupils of the schools.

Assist in or conduct examinations for promotion.- Fifteen cities gave the first superintendent of schools some responsibility for assisting in or conducting examinations to determine the fitness of pupils to be promoted from grade to grade or school to school. In some cities this task had long been the responsibility of examining or visiting committees. There was not, in every case, a willingness to make the first superintendent solely responsible. In Boston he was directed to assist in the examination in such a manner as should be desired by the examining committee.¹ In New Haven he was expected to examine every class and report his observations to the committee of the board on schools.² In contrast to the restrictions imposed in the New England cities, the regulations for Denver and Kansas City are interesting. The superintendent was directed to hold examinations at his discretion to determine proficiency of pupils and success of teachers.³ The regulations for Kansas City specified that the superintendent was to conduct all examinations for the promotion of pupils from one class to another in the schools.⁴ In Houston the superintendent was required to arrange for regular and frequent public examinations of the scholars.⁵ Two cities, Providence⁶ and St. Louis,⁷ gave the superintendent the task of examining the most advanced classes in the primary schools. The superintendent of Cleveland was ordered to aid the visiting committee in making their examinations of the schools.⁸ The regulations in Nashville indicated

¹Op. cit., p. 25.

²Op. cit., sub-chapter ii, sec. 1.

³Op. cit., p. 40.

⁴"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

⁵Loc. cit.

⁶"Minutes of School Committee," op. cit.

⁷Op. cit., p. 19.

⁸Loc. cit.

that the superintendent should aid the teachers in making the examinations.¹

Make promotions.-- Eight cities made provision in their regulations for the superintendent to have some responsibility for making promotions of pupils within the schools. The responsibility varied from complete authority to limited authority to act with the consent and approval of the board or one of its committees. The superintendent of the Columbus schools was authorized to transfer or promote pupils with the concurrence of the committee appointed to attend the examinations.² The regulations for Nashville specified that the superintendent might promote pupils according to the standard of qualifications fixed by the board.³ The promotions were made by the superintendent in Cleveland after the pupils had been found qualified for promotion;⁴ however, the authority which determined the qualifications was a visiting committee and not the superintendent.⁵ Providence,⁶ Rochester,⁷ and St. Louis⁸ directed the superintendents to make the promotion of pupils from the primary to the grammar schools. The Cincinnati superintendent was not allowed to transfer a pupil from one section to another unless he first obtained the consent of the local trustees.

Devise record and report forms.-- The superintendents were given rather generous responsibilities for devising a system of records and reports. Ten cities mentioned the preparation of forms and keeping of records in the list of duties assigned to the first superintendents. In six of the cities he was given the responsibility for devising, preparing, and distributing forms for keeping records. In three cities -- Denver,⁹ Philadelphia,¹⁰ and Salt Lake City¹¹ -- he was directed to devise forms for keeping records and submit the forms to the board for approval. The only direction given to the Cincinnati superintendent in the matter of record keeping was that he was to see that daily and annual registers were neatly and accurately kept.¹²

¹Op. cit., p. 94.

²Loc. cit.

³Op. cit., p. 94.

⁴Loc. cit.

⁵Ibid.

⁶"Minutes of School Committee," op. cit.

⁷Op. cit., p. 20.

⁸Op. cit., p. 19.

⁹Op. cit., p. 40.

¹⁰Op. cit., p. 288.

¹¹Op. cit., p. 4.

¹²"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

Keep register of pupils.- Two of the twenty-six cities, Atlanta¹ and Denver,² required the superintendent to keep a record of all pupils attending the schools. The regulation in Atlanta provided that he should keep a register in which he should record the name and age of the pupil, the parent's or guardian's name and residence, the date of admission, and the school and class of each pupil. In Denver the superintendent was directed to keep in his office a register of the names of all pupils enrolled in the public schools. The register was to give the residence, names and occupations of parents, and such other data as the board of education might prescribe.

Ascertain extent of truancy.- Before the days of careful enumeration of school children and the enactment of compulsory school attendance laws it was difficult to determine the amount of truancy in the schools. In eight cities the superintendents were expected at least to attempt to determine the number of children not attending school. The requirement was substantially the same in seven of the cities. He was directed to ascertain, as far as possible, the number of children not attending school, the causes for their non-attendance, and possible remedies for the situation. In the eighth city, Milwaukee, he was empowered, with the concurrence of the board, to appoint enumerators of the school children.³

Suspend incorrigible pupils.- The superintendent could not be empowered to expel pupils from school. That responsibility belonged to the board of education. In seven cities he was given directions for dealing with incorrigible children. The directions were uniform for the seven cities. The superintendent was expected to make a careful investigation of all cases reported to him, take such action as the conditions seemed to warrant, and report to the board or a committee of the board.

Transfer pupils from one district to another.- Three cities out of the twenty-six -- Chicago,⁴ Rochester,⁵ and Salt Lake City⁶ -- gave authority to the superintendent to transfer children from one district to another. The superintendent in Chicago was given authority to make the transfer, if there were a good reason for the change. The Rochester regulation stated that he might make the transfers under the direction of the committee

¹Op. cit., p. 49.

²Op. cit., p. 39.

³Loc. cit.

⁴Op. cit., p. 62.

⁵Op. cit., p. 21.

⁶Op. cit., p. 5.

on school organization. The transfers were to be made when the interests of the schools demanded them. In Salt Lake City he was given authority to transfer pupils from one school to another. An additional specification required that a permit was to be given by the superintendent of schools or a member of the board of education.

Admit pupils to school.- Three cities -- Chicago,¹ Nashville,² and Rochester³ -- gave the superintendent the authority to admit pupils to school during the school year. The regulation for Chicago provided that he might grant permits in certain cases to pupils to enter school at any time during the quarter. In Nashville the regulations provided that he had power to examine all children who applied for admission. He was further directed to place the child in the grade and building for which he or she was qualified. The superintendent of Rochester was directed to provide admission into the school for all applicants that might be referred to him.

Superintendents' Responsibilities for Conducting Office

Some of the boards of education felt it necessary to prescribe rather definite regulations to control the manner in which the new officer of the school system should conduct an office. It is possible that school systems had no central office previous to the election of a superintendent. In that case it might have been advisable for some prescriptions to be fixed. An examination of the regulations indicates that the superintendent might have been hampered as well as aided by some of the requirements. Table XIII shows the superintendents' responsibilities for conducting an office.

Keep daily office hours.- The dominant purpose in the regulation providing that the superintendent keep regular office hours seems to have been that of providing an opportunity for conferences with teachers. The time of the office hours in seven of the eight cities which directed the superintendent to keep daily office hours was set at an hour when the schools were not in session. The regulations for Los Angeles specified that he was expected to keep regular office hours each day of the week except Sunday.⁴ The most acceptable time for the office hours

¹Op. cit., p. 62.

²Op. cit., p. 95.

³Op. cit., p. 20.

⁴Op. cit., p. 25.

TABLE XIII
RESPONSIBILITIES OF FIRST SUPERINTENDENTS FOR CONDUCTING OFFICE

Cities	Keep Daily Office Hours	Devote Full Time to Office	Communicate Directions to Teachers and Pupils	Have Discretionary Power Where There Are No Rules	Keep Record of His Own Activities	Study Local School System	Study Other School Systems
Atlanta.....	X	X	...	...	...	...	X
Baltimore.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Boston.....	...	...	...	...	...	X	X
Chicago.....	X	...	...	...	X	...	X
Cincinnati.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Cleveland.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Columbus.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Denver.....	X	X	...	X	X	...	...
Houston.....	...	...	X	...	...	...	...
Kansas City.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	X
Los Angeles...	X	...	...	X	...	...	...
Louisville.....	...	...	...	X	...	...	...
Milwaukee.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	X
Minneapolis...	X	...	...	...	...	...	...
Nashville.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
New Haven.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
New Orleans...	...	X	...	...	...	X	X
New York.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	X
Philadelphia..	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Providence....	X	X	...	...	...	...	X
Rochester.....	...	...	...	...	...	X	X
St. Louis.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Salt Lake City	X	...	...	...	...	...	...
San Francisco.	X	X	X	...	...	...	X
Seattle.....	...	...	...	...	...	...	X
Washington....	...	X	...	X	...	...	...

seemed to be after four o'clock in the afternoon. One city, St. Louis,¹ directed the superintendent to be present at the office of the board every business day between the hours of twelve and one.

Devote full time to office.-- Eight cities -- Atlanta,² Denver,³ New Haven,⁴ Philadelphia,⁵ Providence,⁶ Salt Lake City,⁷ Seattle,⁸ and Washington⁹ -- included in their regulations the provision that the superintendent was expected to devote his full time to the duties of the position. The provision seems both unusual and unnecessary. New Haven had previously employed a superintendent for part time only.¹⁰ This fact might explain the inclusion of the provision in the New Haven regulations. The other seven cities, in so far as can be determined from the available records, had never employed a superintendent for part time.

Communicate directions to teachers and pupils.-- Two cities, Denver¹¹ and Salt Lake City,¹² gave the superintendent the responsibility for being the only authority to communicate board actions and wishes to the teachers and pupils of the schools.

Have discretionary power.-- Four cities -- Columbus,¹³ Kansas City,¹⁴ Los Angeles,¹⁵ and Seattle¹⁶--gave the superintendent the privilege of using his discretion in handling situations and conditions not covered by the rules and regulations. In this connection it is interesting to note a complaint from the superintendent of the Toledo, Ohio, schools.¹⁷ In his report for 1852 the superintendent of Toledo begged the board of education either to make rules governing a number of conditions or to give him the privilege of dealing with the conditions as they arose.

¹Op. cit., p. 19.

²Op. cit., p. 48.

³Op. cit., p. 39.

⁴Op. cit., sub-chapter 11, sec. 1.

⁵Op. cit., p. 290.

⁶"Minutes of School Committee," op. cit.

⁷Op. cit., p. 3.

⁸"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

⁹Loc. cit.

¹⁰Op. cit., sub-chapter 11, sec. 1.

¹¹Op. cit., p. 40.

¹²Op. cit., pp. 4-5.

¹³Op. cit., p. 13.

¹⁴"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

¹⁵Op. cit., p. 25.

¹⁶"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

¹⁷Excerpt from Report of A. Smyth, Superintendent of Schools, p. 21. Toledo: Board of Education, 1852.

Keep record of his own activities.- Chicago,¹ Columbus,² Providence,³ and Rochester⁴ stipulated in their regulations that the superintendent was to keep a full and complete record of what he did. This record was to be open to the inspection of the members of the board of education at all times. This provision seems to have been inspired by the fear on the part of the board that the superintendent would not be sufficiently interested in his work to devote all of his energy to it. The requirement probably made it necessary for the superintendent to keep a diary of his daily activities.

Study local school system.- An unusual requirement was found in the regulations of three cities, Boston,⁵ Nashville,⁶ and Providence.⁷ These three cities directed the superintendent to study the local system. Just how a superintendent could efficiently discharge the duties of his office without giving careful study to the local school system cannot be inferred from the regulations of the three cities.

Study other school systems.- One half of the twenty-six cities directed the superintendent to study school systems in other cities. This regulation seems to have been a wise one. At the time when there was little or no literature on school administration, it was possible for superintendents to gain much valuable and helpful information from each other. The practice of consulting each other and exchanging views and policies must have tended to build up a solidarity of professional attitudes and procedures for the best interests of all of the city school systems.

Nine of the thirteen cities gave a specific purpose in asking the superintendent to study other school systems. The board of education hoped that by this means the schools of their own city could be improved. The specific benefits mentioned were in methods of instruction, plans of organization, and manner of discipline. It is interesting to observe, in this connection, that not one board of education seemed to feel that the superintendent might learn something of value concerning school buildings or financial administration. Three cities -- Chicago,⁸ Denver,⁹

¹Op. cit., p. 60.

²Loc. cit.

³"Minutes of School Committee," op. cit.

⁴Op. cit., p. 20.

⁵Op. cit., p. 24.

⁶Op. cit., p. 94.

⁷"Minutes of School Committee," op. cit.

⁸Op. cit., p. 62.

⁹Op. cit., p. 40.

and Providence,¹ stipulated that the superintendent should acquaint himself with the principles and facts of popular education in order that he might be better able to administer the schools which he had been elected to superintend. In one city, New Orleans, the superintendent was directed to visit the school systems of New York and Philadelphia.²

Superintendents' Responsibilities for High Schools

The early regulations gave the superintendent but few definite responsibilities for the high school. The Columbus³ superintendent was made principal of the high school and was charged with its government, discipline, course of study, and instruction. In connection with his duties as principal of the high school, he was directed to make a semi-annual report to the board on the condition and progress of the school. He was also directed to make a report at the end of the year; this report was to be published with his annual report as superintendent of schools. The New Orleans⁴ regulations directed the superintendent to take charge of the boys' school.

The superintendent of Kansas City⁵ was directed to teach some subjects in the high school as the board might indicate.

In Philadelphia⁶ the superintendent was directed to visit the Central High School of that city. At the time of his visits, the superintendent was expected to confer with the president of the school and the committee having charge of the school.

Responsibilities Found in Individual Cities

A number of responsibilities peculiar to individual cities were discovered when the regulations were analyzed.

In Louisville⁷ the school agent was given the responsibility for establishing and conducting a night school with permission to admit ten poor boys free of charge.

Philadelphia⁸ was the only city that mentioned assistant superintendents. In the regulations for Philadelphia provision

¹"Minutes of School Committee," op. cit.

²"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

³Loc. cit.

⁴"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

⁵"Minutes of Board of Directors," op. cit.

⁶Op. cit., p. 287.

⁷Op. cit., pp. 157-58.

⁸Op. cit., p. 290.

was made for the superintendent to submit the names of three persons whom he wished to have appointed as his assistants. After the assistants were appointed, the superintendent was responsible for directing their activities.

Denver¹ had a physician as secretary of the board of education when the first superintendent was elected; he was the leader of a large group of German residents of Denver. The position of authority occupied by this German physician may have been responsible for the regulation relating to health which was included in Denver's rules and regulations. In the regulation the superintendent² was directed to take special pains to secure the physical well being of the pupils. This was to be done by guarding against improper ventilation and by having proper physical exercises in all rooms at suitable intervals. The only approach to a similar provision is that in the Columbus regulations,³ which direct the superintendent to give oral lessons in physiology.

The regulations prescribed in Milwaukee are unique in that particular mention is made of the professional qualifications of the superintendent.⁴ He was to have suitable learning, experience, and skill as well as to be acquainted with the most approved methods of organizing and conducting city schools. To safeguard this requirement Milwaukee made the provision that the superintendent must be a graduate of a college or normal school located in the United States. This requirement might be waived if the candidate could present a certificate of his qualifications from the State Superintendent of Schools.

Providence approached this stipulation in its requirement that all credentials be submitted to a board of examiners.⁵ This board of examiners composed of seven members and appointed by the school committee of Providence was authorized to examine and report on all candidates before the vote to elect a superintendent was taken.

The New York superintendent was charged with the responsibility of seeing that there should be no sectarian religious teaching or books used in the schools.⁶ He was also empowered to annul teachers' certificates under certain conditions; the nature of the certain conditions was not mentioned.

¹Op. cit., p. 40.

²Ibid.

³Op. cit., p. 13.

⁴Op. cit., p. 82.

⁵"Minutes of School Committee," op. cit.

⁶Op. cit., p. 29.

The Nashville¹ superintendent was directed to furnish each teacher with a set of the books used in the schools, and to survey the school districts of the city with a view of changing the boundaries. The boundaries were to be changed only if the change would be advantageous and would reduce the expenses of the schools.

In Los Angeles the superintendent was charged with the responsibility of reporting the statistics of the school system to the state and county superintendents.²

Summary of the Original Duties of Superintendents of Schools
in Twenty-six Cities of the United States

Table XIV presents a summarization of the original duties of the superintendent of schools in twenty-six cities. It is interesting to note that the greatest number of major responsibilities was found in connection with instruction and the smallest number, in connection with financial administration. It is evident that the first superintendents were expected to interest themselves in the educational rather than the financial responsibilities of the school system.

If a more comprehensive interpretation is put on instruction, it is possible to include under it several different responsibilities. If the responsibilities for instruction, the teaching staff, the pupil personnel, and the high school are combined, the total number of items is 207, or 51.6 per cent of the grand total of 401 responsibilities. The remaining responsibilities, 193, or 48.4 per cent, may be considered as being related to the administration of the school systems. Thus the 401 duties and responsibilities are divided almost equally between instruction and administration.

The data presented in Table XV make possible a finer analysis of the original duties of the twenty-six superintendents. There are twenty-six responsibilities which were found in more than twenty-five per cent of the cities. Of the twenty-six responsibilities, seventeen were in instruction and nine in administration. Of the four responsibilities which were found in more than sixty per cent of the cities, three were in instruction and one in administration. Two responsibilities, both in instruction, were found in more than eighty per cent of the cities; while only one, the supervision of the schools, was found in more than ninety per cent of the cities.

¹Op. cit., p. 95.

²Op. cit., p. 25.

TABLE XIV

THE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF TWENTY-SIX SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS AT TIME THE OFFICE WAS CREATED

Cities	Responsibilities to Board of Education	Responsibilities to Board Committees	Responsibilities for Financial Administration	Responsibilities for School Plant	Responsibilities for Reporting	Responsibilities for Teaching Staff	Responsibilities for Instruction	Responsibilities for Pupil Personnel	Responsibilities for Conducting Office	Responsibilities for High School	Responsibilities Peculiar to Individual Cities	Totals
Atlanta.....	3	..	..	..	4	2	3	4	3	..	1	20
Baltimore.....	..	..	..	..	2	..	4	..	2	..	..	6
Boston.....	1	1	1	1	1	..	2	2	..	..	..	11
Chicago.....	5	..	..	1	1	1	5	2	3	..	..	19
Cincinnati....	1	..	..	..	1	..	5	3	..	..	..	10
Cleveland.....	2	..	..	..	3	2	4	2	..	..	..	12
Columbus.....	1	..	..	1	3	2	5	4	2	1	..	19
Denver.....	3	..	..	1	3	5	5	6	4	..	1	28
Houston.....	1	..	..	1	..	1	2	1	..	..	..	6
Kansas City...	1	..	..	..	2	1	2	1	1	1	..	9
Los Angeles...	3	..	..	2	2	3	5	2	3	..	1	21
Louisville....	2	..	2	3	2	..	3	..	..	..	1	13
Milwaukee....	3	1	1	..	..	1	3	1	..	..	1	11
Minneapolis...	3	1	..	..	1	3	3	1	1	..	..	13
Nashville.....	4	2	1	..	2	5	4	5	2	..	1	26
New Haven.....	1	..	..	1	1	2	4	2	2	..	..	12
New Orleans...	1	..	..	..	..	1	1	1	1	1	..	6
New York.....	2	..	..	1	2	1	5	..	..	..	2	13
Philadelphia..	1	2	..	1	1	3	4	3	5	1	1	19
Providence....	2	1	..	1	2	..	5	3	2	..	..	19
Rochester.....	2	..	1	2	2	3	5	3	1	..	..	21
St. Louis.....	4	1	..	2	3	1	2	2	1	..	..	16
Salt Lake City	1	1	..	1	3	4	5	5	4	..	..	24
San Francisco.	3	1	3	1	1	2	3	1	1	..	..	16
Seattle.....	3	..	..	..	2	2	4	1	2	..	..	14
Washington....	3	..	..	2	1	3	6	..	2	..	..	17
Totals.....	56	11	9	22	45	48	99	56	42	4	9	401
Percentage of total.....	13.96	2.74	2.24	5.49	11.22	11.97	24.69	13.96	10.45	9.97	2.24	

TABLE XV

AN ANALYSIS OF THE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF TWENTY-SIX
SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS AT THE TIME THE
OFFICE WAS CREATED

Responsibilities	Number of Cities	Per Cent of Cities
1. Responsibilities to the board of education:		
Act under direction of board.....	11	42.30
Act as executive officer of board.....	3	11.50
Act as secretary of board.....	3	11.50
Attend meetings of board.....	11	42.30
Enforce regulations of board.....	12	46.10
Accept additional duties from board.....	5	19.20
Give advice to board.....	11	42.30
2. Responsibilities to board committees:		
Aid committees when requested to do so..	6	23.00
Attend committee meetings when requested	5	19.20
3. Responsibilities for financial administration:		
Make quarterly financial report.....	2	7.70
Recommend financial measures.....	3	11.50
Execute contracts for work, materials, or leases.....	1	3.84
Assist in audit of school accounts.....	1	3.84
Make bills for contingent expenses.....	1	3.84
Keep an expense account for each school.	1	3.84
4. Responsibilities for school plant:		
Give aid in planning new buildings.....	4	15.40
Notify board or committee when repairs are needed.....	6	23.00
Superintend schools, schoolhouses and apparatus.....	9	34.60
Issue proposals for furnishing fuel.....	2	7.70
Prohibit use of school buildings for other purposes.....	1	3.84
5. Responsibilities for reporting:		
Make an annual report.....	20	77.00
Make a quarterly report.....	10	38.50
Make a monthly report.....	8	30.80
Make additional reports on request of board.....	7	27.00
6. Responsibilities for teaching staff:		
Assist in examining applicants for teaching positions.....	11	43.20
Hold teachers' meetings.....	13	50.00
Fill temporary vacancies.....	8	30.80
Report inefficient teachers to board....	9	34.60
Assist in establishing a normal class or school.....	4	15.40
Recommend teachers for election.....	3	11.50
7. Responsibilities for distribution:		
Supervise the schools.....	25	96.20
Visit all schools.....	22	84.60
Guard classification of pupils.....	12	46.10
Assist in selection of books.....	8	30.80
Cause course of study to be followed....	13	50.00

TABLE XV (Continued)

Responsibilities	Number of Cities	Per Cent of Cities
7. Responsibilities for distribution (cont.):		
Aid teachers in discipline.....	16	61.50
Provide books for indigent pupils.....	3	11.50
8. Responsibilities for pupil personnel:		
Assist in or conduct examinations for promotion.....	15	57.70
Make promotions.....	8	30.80
Determine form of records for pupils...	10	38.60
Keep attendance register of all pupils.	2	7.70
Ascertain number of children not in school.....	8	30.80
Suspend pupils for violation of rules of school.....	7	27.00
Transfer pupils from one district to another.....	3	11.50
Admit pupils to school.....	3	11.50
9. Responsibilities for conducting office:		
Keep daily office hours.....	8	30.80
Devote full time to the office.....	8	30.80
Communicate directions to teachers and pupils.....	2	7.70
Have discretionary power where there are no rules.....	4	15.40
Keep record of proceedings open to board.....	4	15.40
Study local school system.....	3	11.50
Study other school systems.....	13	50.00
10. Responsibilities for high school:		
Take charge of high school.....	2	7.70
Teach in high school.....	1	3.84
Visit the high school.....	1	3.84
11. Responsibilities peculiar to individual cities:		
Establish and conduct night schools....	1	3.84
Suggest names and direct activities of assistant superintendent.....	1	3.84
Responsible for health of pupils.....	1	3.84
Have graduated from college or normal school.....	1	3.84
Guard against sectarian teachings.....	1	3.84
Furnish a set of textbooks for each teacher.....	1	3.84
May annul teachers' certificates.....	1	3.84
May change boundaries of school dis- tricts.....	1	3.84
Report statistics to state and county superintendents.....	1	3.84

CHAPTER IV

DUTIES OF THE SUPERINTENDENT WITH RESPECT TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A GRADED SYSTEM OF SCHOOLS

Early Classification of Schools

The early superintendents of city systems found a classification of schools known as primary, intermediate, grammar, and high school. This organization had developed under the administration of lay boards of education. The growth of the school population in towns and cities had resulted in the establishment of more schools of the several classes. Promotions were made from the highest group in one school to the lowest group in the next school. Within the schools was found imperfect articulation and little differentiation of work among teachers. Each teacher in a primary school, for instance, might and often did give instruction to pupils of all ages and stages of advancement for that classification of school.

The lack of proper grading is well illustrated in the fifth annual report of the superintendent of the Boston schools.¹ According to this official the Boston primary schoolrooms contained about sixty pupils usually divided into eight or nine groups or classes.²

The superintendent suggested that the groups of children of equal attainment in the several primary rooms be placed together. The plan would have made larger classes and would have reduced the number of groups of children under the direction of any one teacher. Obviously, the suggestion of the Boston superintendent was sound, and the suggestion apparently was the contribution of the superintendent. The previous lay control either had not seen the possibility of such a solution or seeing it, had failed in the execution of the plan.

The early superintendents of schools gave a large part of their time to the improvement of the classification and gradation of the school systems which they had been elected to superintend.

¹Fifth Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Boston Schools, pp. 45-47. Boston: School Committee, 1855.

²Ibid., p. 46.

Wide Variation in Early Classification

Probably no two school systems in the country had exactly the same gradation in the early days. Neither did any two cities go through the same stages of change and development in the process of emerging into the graded school system as it is organized today. To trace the development in a number of the cities would require more time than is possible for this phase of the investigation. The variations in the evolution are no doubt due to a number of factors. No two cities had the same economic, social, and political problems to face. Furthermore, there was great variation in financial resources available for school purposes. Tradition, which has always been an important factor in school organization and management, was conditioned by the individual communities rather than by any nation-wide forces and factors. But in spite of the variables mentioned, the early superintendents were working toward approximately the same ends. Their tasks in connection with grading were to classify the pupils into groups that could be instructed more satisfactorily than was possible under the ungraded plan.

It is the purpose of this chapter to point out some of the common problems with which the early superintendents struggled in their efforts to grade and to classify the schools.

Problems Which Confronted the Superintendent in Grading Lancastrian or Monitorial Schools

The Lancastrian system of school organization which had flourished in parts of America during the first quarter of the nineteenth century left a heritage of problems for the early superintendents.

The adoption of the Lancastrian system in America was clearly the responsibility of lay administration. The necessity of providing for larger numbers of pupils was pressing. The new system made it possible for one teacher to instruct from three to five hundred pupils or more in one room. Governor Clinton of New York was reported to have made an address at the opening of the first school of the Free School Society of New York on December 1, 1809, in which he characterized Lancaster as the benefactor of the human race. The Lancastrian system, in the opinion of Clinton, was a blessing sent down from heaven to redeem the poor and distressed from the power and dominion of ignorance.¹ Governor

¹William Oland Bourne, History of the Public School Society of the City of New York, p. 19. New York: William Wood and Co., 1870.

Wolcott of Connecticut, in a message sent to the Legislature in 1825, urged the establishment of Lancasterian schools where from two hundred to one thousand children could be conveniently assembled. Wolcott thought this mode of instruction was much more efficient, direct, and economical than the one then in use in the state.¹

The large classrooms of the Lancasterian school buildings were poorly adapted to the plans for the grading of the schools. The Lancasterian system set up a separate school on each floor of a school building and each floor was in charge of an independent principal. Tradition carried this organization over to make it a problem for many of the early superintendents to solve. Baltimore, Cleveland, Louisville, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, New Haven, New York, and St. Louis are some of the cities whose schools, at one time, were operated on the Lancasterian plan.

The superintendent of St. Louis in the report for 1867 devoted considerable space to a recount of the handicaps which the large schoolrooms of the Lancasterian system placed on the development of a graded system of schools.² The altering of the old Lancasterian buildings placed on the St. Louis Board of Education a financial burden which it had difficulty in meeting.³ There were in one of the buildings six separate school organizations, each with its own principal.⁴

The superintendent of Cleveland in the annual report for 1868 mentioned a similar situation in that city.⁵

The New York heritage of the Lancasterian plan was found in the custom of having two separate principals and school organizations in a single school building.⁶ This practice was expensive and was a decided handicap to the development of a graded

¹Oliver Wolcott, Message of His Excellency Oliver Wolcott, Governor of the State of Connecticut to the General Assembly, May Session, 1825, p. 14. Hartford: Charles Babcock (Printer), 1825.

²Thirteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Schools, pp. 114-18. St. Louis: Board of Directors, 1867.

³Ibid., p. 115.

⁴Ibid., p. 116.

⁵Thirty-second Report of the Board of Education of the City of Cleveland, pp. 63-65. Cleveland: Board of Education, 1868.

⁶Seventh Annual Report of the Department of Education of the City of New York, pp. 40-42. New York: Board of Education, 1905.

organization. The superintendent in the report for 1905 spoke of the consolidation, during that year, of several more of these schools.¹

In Milwaukee it was necessary to remodel the old buildings that had been erected for schools organized on the Lancastrian plan.² Not only were the large rooms wasteful of space when the size of classes was reduced, but there was also a tendency to fill them to capacity. So long as this was done it was impossible properly to grade and classify the schools.

It can be claimed that the Lancastrian system aided in extending the privilege of school attendance to a greater number of children. The per pupil cost of instruction under the system was low. These facts encouraged the expansion of school organizations. Whether the advantages of the expansion outweigh the handicaps to effective gradation and instruction imposed by the Lancastrian system is a question which is difficult to answer.

School Building Problems in Connection with Grading the Schools

The problems of school buildings in their relation to grading are of two types. First, the superintendent was confronted with the necessity of convincing the authority responsible for erecting the buildings that structures of another type and size were necessary. In the second place, there was lack of sufficient seating to accommodate the pupils. This condition resulted in unusually large classes, particularly in the lower grades. As long as seventy-five or one hundred pupils were placed in one room under one teacher there was little possibility of what would today be considered satisfactory grading.

New York seemed to have been particularly unfortunate in this respect. The assistant superintendent of the schools of New York in the report for 1873 gave an account of the overcrowded conditions in some of their schools.³ In forty-seven schools it was necessary to attempt to teach from two to four classes in one room at the same time. Two hundred primary classes were taught during part or all of the time in rooms with one or more other

¹Ibid.

²Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners to His Honor the Mayor and Common Council of Milwaukee, pp. 35-36. Milwaukee: Board of School Commissioners, 1872.

³Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Schools to the Board of Education of the City of New York, pp. 56-59. New York: Board of Education, 1873.

classes. In the primary schools and departments six hundred classes had more than sixty pupils in each class. More than one-half of these classes contained from seventy to seventy-five pupils. The by-laws of the board of education of New York required an average of thirty-five pupils per teacher in the grammar schools and an average of fifty pupils per teacher in the primary schools. In consequence of the required average attendance of fifty pupils, the principals of the primary schools felt compelled to make the classes large.¹

The superintendent of the schools of Nashville, in the report of 1860, stated that the schools of that city had been graded and classified as far as the limited school buildings would permit.² In the report of Cleveland for 1866 the superintendent insisted that until sufficient buildings were erected to permit a reduction in the size of classes the schools would be in an unsatisfactory condition.³ In the same report the superintendent expressed himself as being in favor of large schools in large school buildings.⁴ His argument was that the greater the number of children the more refined could be the classification.⁵

Chicago also suffered from the lack of sufficient classrooms. As early as 1859 the superintendent complained of insufficient space to accommodate properly the primary schools.⁶ Again in 1866 the superintendent referred to the excessive number of pupils per teacher.⁷ Apparently the problems and evils of overcrowding had not abated in 1879, when the superintendent again referred to them.⁸

The superintendent of Philadelphia in the first report, made in 1883, referred to the fact that lack of sufficient secondary schools was impeding promotions from the primary schools.⁹ His suggestion was to abolish, at least partially, the hard and fast lines then existing between the several divisions of the

¹Ibid., p. 59.

²Third Annual Report of the Public Schools, p. 7. Nashville: Board of Education, 1869.

³Thirteenth Annual Report of the Public Schools of Cleveland, pp. 20-23. Cleveland: Board of Education, 1866.

⁴Ibid., p. 20.

⁵Ibid., p. 23.

⁶Report of the Superintendent to the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, pp. 20-22. Chicago: Board of Education, 1859.

⁷Ibid., 1866, pp. 62-64.

⁸Ibid., 1879, pp. 13-17.

⁹Sixty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 52-54. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1883.

school system.¹

Providence was faced with much the same situation in 1887. The superintendent, in the report for that year, mentioned the difficulties of grading due to the custom of erecting primary buildings of four rooms each.² He concluded his report with the statement that the distinction between primary and intermediate schools was a useless one.

San Francisco and Washington had building problems which varied to some extent from those already mentioned. The superintendent of San Francisco in the report for 1861 mentioned the fact that the sparse population in the vicinity of some of their school buildings prevented the establishment of well-graded schools.³ The superintendent of Washington in the report for 1871-1872 expressed the conviction that, since the schools were then able to relinquish the isolated rented rooms, the work of grading and classification would go on much more rapidly.⁴

The acting school visitor of the New Haven schools in the annual report for 1859 set up a number of criteria for graded schools. In connection with school buildings the visitor was of the opinion that large buildings were essential to a well-graded school.⁵ He made the assertion that the people of New Haven were committed to school buildings that would house six hundred pupils. In the matter of size of schoolrooms the visitor was convinced that no schoolroom should furnish seats for more pupils than a single teacher could efficiently instruct.⁶

Combining Schools and Grades

Several deeply rooted traditions of school organization had to be broken down or ignored when the superintendents decided that better grading would be facilitated by combining schools and grades. The district system of school organization was of long standing. For many years the districts had been considered, in school affairs, as self-sufficient kingdoms. To suggest that

¹Ibid., p. 53.

²Annual Report of the School Committee of Providence, pp. 29-32 Providence: School Committee, 1887.

³Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools of the City and County of San Francisco, p. 29. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1862.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of Public Schools of the District of Columbia, p. 27. Washington: Board of Trustees, 1872.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education of the New Haven City School District, p. 29. New Haven: Board of Education, 1859.

⁶Ibid., p. 30.

pupils of one district should attend the schools of another district was certain to meet with strenuous opposition. Another strong tradition, in some sections, was the custom of boys and girls attending separate schools or at least separate rooms in the same school. No less strong was the tradition of the vertical organization of schools. Primary schools were intended for primary-grade pupils and grammar schools for grammar-grade pupils. However, the time came when the best interests of the pupils demanded that combinations of grades and schools be made.

The examiners of the Boston schools in the report for 1852 raised the question of combining some of the schools then in existence.¹ The recommendation had been made previously by the superintendent in his first annual report.² The suggestion of the examining committee was referred to a special committee of the school committee. This special committee made a favorable recommendation to the city council by which body it was referred to its committee on public instruction.³ The committee on public instruction of the city council considered the situation carefully and made a favorable report to the council. The council then passed a resolution approving the change.⁴ The change involved abandoning three schools, selling the schoolhouses, and using the funds to improve and enlarge three other schoolhouses.⁵ The chief end to be served in the combination, as admitted by all of the bodies and organizations having a part in the change, was that of better classification by reason of having a larger number of pupils in the buildings.⁶

Boston was unique at that time in having a form of school organization known as the "double headed system."⁷ In this plan of organization each grammar school was divided into what was known as a grammar and a writing school, each school with a separate master. Pupils alternated in their attendance at the two schools -- that is, they attended one school for half of the day, and the other school for the other half of the day. In some

¹Boston School Reports, Boston, School Committee, 1851-68, Report of the Annual Examination of the Public Schools, pp. 22-26. Boston: School Committee, 1852.

²Ibid., p. 23.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 25.

⁵Ibid., p. 26.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Third Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, pp. 6-18. Boston: School Committee, 1853.

cases the girls attended one school while the boys attended the other.¹

The superintendent of Boston in the report for 1853 attacked this plan of organization as being expensive and as preventing the proper grading of the schools.² The report of the school committee for 1855 mentioned the fact that the last of the old "double headed" schools had been abolished.³

Another problem which hindered the establishment of graded schools in Boston was the separation of the sexes in the grammar schools. In the report for 1855 the superintendent presented several arguments to show that the interests of both sexes would be better served if the sexes were educated in the same schools.⁴ The superintendent pointed out that the arguments for and against separation, as generally advanced, just about counter-balanced each other. Such being the case he believed that the matter should be adjusted on the basis of convenience, and on such a basis the preponderance of argument was in favor of the co-educational school.

The superintendent of Cleveland in the report for 1876 stated that the work of classification was greatly facilitated by putting boys and girls in the same schoolrooms.⁵ In addition to the advantages gained by combining the sexes, the superintendent mentioned the beneficial effects that the combining of the highest classes in adjacent school districts would have on grading.

Much the same suggestion was made by the superintendent of New York in 1877. He advised uniting the male and female departments and also uniting small schools in the same district.⁶ In the opinion of the superintendent these changes not only would improve the efficiency of the schools but also would serve to reduce the cost of their operation.⁷

¹Ibid., pp. 9-10.

²Ibid., p. 18.

³Boston School Reports, Boston, School Committee, 1851-68, Annual Report of the School Committee, p. 11. Boston: School Committee, 1855.

⁴Annual Report of the School Committee Together with the Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, pp. 48-50. Boston: School Committee, 1855.

⁵Twenty-third Annual Report of the Public Schools, p. 37. Cleveland: Board of Education, 1876.

⁶Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, pp. 181-82. New York: Board of Education, 1877.

⁷Ibid., p. 182.

The superintendent of Louisville in the report for 1864 recommended that the number of grammar schools in the city be reduced from nine to three or four. His reasons were that the expenses of operating these schools would thereby be reduced and the greater number of pupils to each school would afford better opportunities for grading.¹

In 1872 the superintendent of Columbus reported that the grammar schools of that city had been reduced from six to three.² The change, he said, made possible an enrolment of from forty to fifty pupils in each class rather than fifteen or twenty.³ Not only was the expense of operating the schools reduced, but also the tendency to nullify the benefits of grading, by filling up the rooms with pupils of another grade, was avoided by the combinations described.

In 1875 the superintendent of St. Louis reported that grades and schools were being combined as rapidly as was possible.⁴ In the opinion of the superintendent the consolidation accomplished three things: (1) secured uniformity and simplicity in the organization of schools, (2) improved the classification, (3) made for economy in the operating of the schools.⁵ In the same report the superintendent stated that the sexes were then educated together in all grades, and that previous to 1857 they had been separated in all grades below the high school.⁶

It seems evident that the necessity for combining grades appeared much later in some cities than in others. In 1890 the superintendent of Kansas City advocated the union of the upper grades in the schools of the city.⁷ The arguments advanced were a reduction in expense, better grading, and more room for the lower-grade pupils.⁸

Perhaps the argument of economy in administration was the effective influence used by the superintendents of schools in

¹Report of Superintendent of Schools, p. 118. Louisville: School Committee, 1864.

²Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 10. Columbus: Board of Education, 1872.

³Ibid.

⁴Twenty-first Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, pp. 174-75. St. Louis: Board of Directors, 1875.

⁵Ibid., p. 175.

⁶Ibid.

⁷The President's Report to the People of the School District of Kansas City, p. 70. Kansas City: Board of Education, 1891.

⁸Ibid.

achieving the consolidation of schools and grades. Whatever the argument, the consummation of the task was no mean achievement and materially aided in the proper classification of the schools.

Developing a Course of Study

The early superintendents found, in most cities, a course of study of some sort in operation when they assumed office, but a course of study designed for primary, intermediate, and grammar schools as grades was not successfully applicable to a well-graded school system. The early gradation assumed that an individual teacher would have charge of several classes within the grade of the school in which she was teaching. The revised grading, in most cases, placed the work of each year under a different teacher. In the former case the limits of the work to be covered in any year could be rather loosely indicated; in the latter case it was necessary that the limits be very definitely stated. The defining of the limits of the work for each grade and the instruction of the teachers in what were to them the intricacies of a graded school system were important duties of the early superintendents.¹

The assistant superintendent of the New York schools, in the report for 1857, discussed the lack of gradation in the course of study.² He insisted that the only subject in which grade limits were clearly defined was arithmetic.³ It was the opinion of this officer that the course of study would be much more satisfactory if grade limits were defined in all subjects.⁴ In 1861 the superintendent of schools recommended that the number of studies be reduced to lessen the pressure placed on both teachers and pupils.⁵

The report of the superintendent of San Francisco for 1859 made the statement that one of his first official acts was a complete revision of the course of study.⁶ In the same report he predicted that the course, as revised, would require but few additional changes. This feeling was evidently not shared by succeeding superintendents. The reports of the superintendents

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, p. 27. New York: Board of Education, 1857.

²Ibid., pp. 27-28.

³Ibid., p. 27.

⁴Ibid., pp. 10-11, 1861.

⁵Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools of the City and County of San Francisco, p. 5. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1859.

⁶Ibid.

for 1870,¹ 1874,² 1876,³ made mention of the fact that other revisions of the course of study had taken place.

The superintendent of Cincinnati, making the first report in 1850, advised the board of trustees and school visitors that the time devoted to the study of arithmetic was not well proportioned between mental and practical arithmetic.⁴ In the report for 1856 the superintendent referred to the fact that the course of study had been revised during the year.⁵ The revision made definite assignments of work to be covered in each grade of the schools.⁶ The new course of study, according to the report of the superintendent, gave a different significance to the term grade.⁷ That term was then applied to groups of pupils having about the same qualifications, while under previous courses the term had been applied to a group of pupils working under a teacher, no matter what their qualifications had been.⁸

The acting school visitor of New Haven in the final report to the board of education made some interesting comments on the necessity for graded courses of study.⁹ The visitor was of the opinion that neither teachers nor committees had a definite idea of the sort of education they were providing.¹⁰ He felt also that the course of study was without plan, and that pupils were compelled to go over and over again materials that should have been learned earlier.¹¹ The remedy for this condition of affairs, the visitor said, was in the adoption of a course of study which defined the amount of material to be covered in each school year.¹² In the report for 1860 the acting superintendent of the New Haven schools suggested that the best interests of the school system

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, p. 63. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1870.

²Ibid., p. 62, 1874.

³Ibid., p. 2, 1876.

⁴Twenty-first Annual Report of the Trustees and Visitors of Common Schools, p. 27. Cincinnati: Committee of Trustees and Visitors, 1850.

⁵Annual Report of the Trustees and Visitors of Common Schools, pp. 8-10. Cincinnati: Committee of Trustees and Visitors, 1856.

⁶Ibid., p. 9.

⁷Ibid., p. 44, 1856.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Op. cit., pp. 32-34.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 32.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid., p. 33.

demanding that a definite course of study for the different grades be laid out.¹ Finally, in the report for 1861, the superintendent mentioned that, in accordance with the direction of the board of education, he had arranged a course of study in the elementary schools.²

In the annual report issued in 1861 the superintendent of Chicago called attention to the fact that the revised course of study had been in operation for one year.³ This course of study, the report stated, had been worked out with the special cooperation of the teachers.⁴ It was the result of experimentation which had been going on in the schools over a period of several years.⁵ Two years later, in the report for 1863, the superintendent stated that the graded course of study was in full operation.⁶ The course had, in the opinion of this official, done much to systematize the classification of the schools.⁷

The superintendent of St. Louis in the report for 1868 mentioned some of the difficulties he had encountered in establishing a graded course of study.⁸ The objections raised were that the graded course of study made the work of the schoolroom monotonous and "like a treadmill," and that it held back the bright pupils.⁹ In the same report the superintendent listed four of the then-recognized advantages of a graded course of study and a graded system of schools.

The advantages as listed by the St. Louis superintendent were:

1. Thereby perfect classification is secured so that each recitation may have its full time.
2. Thereby the entering upon any branch of study before mastering the branches upon which it depends is prevented.

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education of the New Haven City School District, p. 31. New Haven: Board of Education, 1860.

²Ibid., pp. 12-13, 1871.

³Eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of Chicago, pp. 6-8. Chicago: Board of Education, 1861.

⁴Ibid., pp. 6-7.

⁵Ibid., p. 6.

⁶Tenth Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 16. Chicago: Board of Education, 1863.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Fourteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, pp. 96-97. St. Louis: Board of Directors, 1868.

⁹Ibid., p. 96.

3. Thereby pupils may remove from one school to another and yet enter classes equally progressed in each branch.
4. It enables a large system to be supervised readily by one Board of Directors, since each school can be readily compared with all the rest.¹

In the school report for 1871 the superintendent of Milwaukee urged a revision of the course of study adopted in 1868.² Evidently this course had been devised without the assistance of the superintendent of schools.

In an historical sketch of the Columbus schools, contained in the superintendent's report for 1875, mention was made of the fact that one of the chief duties of the first superintendent of schools of Columbus had been to classify the system and arrange a graded course of instruction.³ This course of study was revised in 1872 by the superintendent of schools and the length of the elementary school course was reduced from nine to eight years.⁴

The superintendent of Los Angeles in the report for 1881 made the statement that on assuming his office he found that there was no written or printed course of study for the schools.⁵ His solution of the difficulty was to prepare a manual which contained the rules of the school system and his new course of study.⁶

If any further evidence is needed to substantiate the statement that the superintendents of schools were responsible for the preparation of the first closely graded courses of study, the case of Philadelphia should provide that evidence. Philadelphia had no superintendent of schools until 1883; the school system had been established in 1820. In the first report, 1883, the superintendent stated that he had, during the year, developed a new course of study for the primary schools of the city.⁷ The new course, according to the superintendent, was a radical departure from the one which had been in use.⁸ The course was

¹Ibid., p. 97.

²Milwaukee Public Schools. Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners to His Honor the Mayor and Common Council of Milwaukee, pp. 36-37. Milwaukee: Board of School Commissioners, 1871.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 141. Columbus: Board of Education, 1875.

⁴Ibid., p. 12, 1872.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles, pp. 19-20. Los Angeles: Board of Education, 1881.

⁶Ibid., p. 20.

⁷Op. cit., pp. 21-22.

⁸Ibid., p. 22.

apparently designed to eliminate much of the formal teaching which had been prevalent in the schools. Three years later, in the report for 1886, the revision of the grammar school course of study was mentioned.¹ In the same report the president of the board of education congratulated that body on the fact that in matters of a professional nature they now had an authority, the superintendent, to whom they could turn for expert advice.²

Providing for the Promotion of Pupils

Concurrent with the early superintendent's activities in planning and remodeling buildings and developing graded courses of study were the duties of establishing methods and standards for the promotion of pupils from grade to grade. As indicated in the first chapter, promotions were made by the examining committees in the days before the advent of the superintendent. The examinations, as conducted by these committees, took on the nature of a public display and exhibition. So far as promotion was concerned, the chief criterion was the necessity for space to provide for the pupils who wished to enter the lowest grades of the schools. Pupils were promoted when the space was needed; and, until graded courses of study were developed, no one knew whether the requirements for promotions had been fulfilled or not, or in fact, what the requirements were.

The assistant superintendent of the schools of New York in the annual report for 1863 mentioned the lack of care in making promotions from grade to grade.³ Another defect referred to in the same report was the promiscuous promotion of pupils from grade to grade for the purpose of filling up depleted classes.⁴ This reaction on the part of the assistant superintendent is interesting in the light of what had occurred in 1859. In that year twenty-four of the male principals of the grammar schools of New York memorialized the board of education, protesting against the system of examination used by the superintendent of schools.⁵ The superintendent's system was characterized as undemocratic, despotic, and unfair.⁶ After a conference of the principals, the superintendent's staff, and the committee on courses of studies,

¹Ibid., pp. 8-11, 1886.

²Ibid., p. 11.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, p. 54. New York: Board of Education, 1863.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., pp. 8-10, 1859.

⁶Ibid., pp. 8-9.

the principals retracted.¹ Later events indicate that the superintendent became the controlling authority in making promotions in New York. In the report for 1887 the scheme for giving examinations and making promotions was outlined in detail.² No examinations were to be held or promotions made without the consent of the superintendent of schools.³ There was, however, at this date a tendency for some of the grammar school principals to make the examinations too severe because of lack of accommodations in their buildings.⁴ This condition was corrected in a recommendation made by the superintendent in the report for 1896. His recommendation was that when pupils had completed the work of the highest grade in the primary schools they should be promoted to the grammar schools. This procedure, the superintendent stated, would eliminate the plan of competitive examinations and would be beneficial to the pupils concerned.⁵

The superintendent of Milwaukee apparently had some difficulty in establishing his authority over the procedure in examinations and promotions. In the annual report for 1869 the superintendent referred to the fact that while he was conducting the examinations for promotion, a question arose as to his authority to proceed.⁶ In the report for 1870 all question of the superintendent's authority was settled. Not only did he examine the schools, but also a set of regulations was drawn up governing his authority to act as examiner.⁷ The regulations provided that all examinations for promotion were to be made by the superintendent or by some person designated by him, and the permanent records of the results of all examinations were to be kept in the superintendent's office.

The superintendent apparently had less difficulty in assuming control of the promotion machinery in Chicago. In the first annual report of the superintendent of Chicago, issued in 1854, mention was made of the lack of standards for making promotions.⁸

¹Ibid., p. 10.

²Forty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, pp. 124-26. New York: Board of Education, 1887.

³Ibid., p. 124.

⁴Ibid., pp. 125-26.

⁵Ibid., p. 153, 1896.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners to the Mayor and Common Council of Milwaukee, pp. 14-15. Milwaukee: Board of School Commissioners, 1869.

⁷Ibid., pp. 27-29, 1870.

⁸Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, pp. 6-7. Chicago: Board of Education, 1854.

After citing the defects the superintendent stated that a system of promotions, depending on the qualifications of the pupils after examination, had been adopted.¹ In the reports for 1866² and 1875³ mention was made of the methods of promotion, and from all indications the superintendent was the final authority in making and altering promotion procedures.

The situation in Louisville furnished a contrast to what was found in Chicago. Louisville's first superintendent was elected in 1837. For ten years, until 1847, he was called the school agent and was not concerned to any great extent with the educational program of the city. In 1847, the school agent became known as the superintendent and assumed full responsibility for the school system. However, there is nothing in the reports of Louisville schools to show that the superintendent had any great amount of authority in making promotions until after 1870. The examinations for promotions were conducted by examining committees as late as 1866.⁴ In the report for 1869, the superintendent complained of the lack of definite plans and standards for promotion.⁵ It is to be supposed that the superintendent did, at some time, acquire or assume the responsibility for making promotion plans, but there is nothing in the available records to show just when the responsibilities were assumed.

From the reports of the superintendents of schools of Nashville, Tennessee, the development of promotions in the schools of that city can be traced. The report for 1856 gives an account of the attendance of parents and friends at the school examinations and describes how classes were brought, one by one, into a specially fitted room for the promotional examination. So many visitors came that some of them could not witness the examination on account of lack of space.⁶ The superintendent felt that much good was accomplished by this contact of the people with the schools. No mention was made of the standards for promotion or of the method used in determining the qualifications for promotion. In the report for 1860 the superintendent gave an account of the examinations which had been conducted by a special

¹Ibid., p. 7.

²Ibid., pp. 71-74, 1866.

³Ibid., pp. 51-57, 1875.

⁴Annual Reports of the Schools, p. 52. Louisville: School Committee, 1866.

⁵Ibid., p. 71, 1869.

⁶Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, p. 13. Nashville: Board of Education, 1857.

committee of aldermen and councilmen.¹ Again no mention was made of standards or qualifications for promotion. In the report for 1881 the superintendent explained the standards which had been set up as qualifications for promotion.² It may be concluded that the superintendent encountered difficulty in establishing meaningful standards for promotions. There is, however, the possibility that he was satisfied with the type of procedure which was prevalent for a number of years.

The recommendations of the superintendent of San Francisco on promotion furnish additional evidence with regard to the evolution of the superintendent's responsibility for promotion practices. In the report for 1861 the superintendent recommended that promotion in the grammar grades be made annually.³ In 1876 he recommended that promotions be made without the usual examinations in order to eliminate the excitement as well as the loss of time caused by examinations.⁴ The next year, 1877, he further recommended that definite age limits be set for entrance to the several grades of schools. His argument was that pupils were being passed along so rapidly that they were reaching the high school at an immature age.⁵ One year later, in 1878, the recommendation of half-year promotions and promotions on trial was made; the argument advanced was that greater elasticity in the graded system would be secured.⁶ Ten years later, in 1888, the superintendent recommended that all promotions be made on the basis of the recommendation of the principals and teachers.⁷ Evidently there had been a reversion to the examination method in the ten-year period between 1878 and 1888. The reasons given for the last change were: (1) avoidance of "cramming," (2) saving of time, (3) saving of energy of pupils and teachers, (4) need of teachers to make a closer study of individual pupils.⁸ Finally, in the report for 1901 the superintendent explained another plan of promotions which had been worked out by the principals and himself.⁹ This plan recommended examinations conducted by the teachers for about half the pupils in each class. While there was a shifting of means to

¹Ibid., p. 5, 1860.

²Ibid., pp. 18-20, 1881.

³Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools,
p. 48. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1861.

⁴Ibid., p. 62, 1876.

⁵Ibid., p. 54, 1877.

⁶Ibid., p. 44, 1878.

⁷Ibid., pp. 31-36, 1888.

⁸Ibid., pp. 31-34.

⁹Ibid., pp. 12-13, 1901.

be used as criteria for making the promotions, no apparent shift in the responsibility for plans was evident. The superintendent, from all indications, was always responsible for the practice with respect to the promotion of pupils within the school system.

Apparently the superintendent of Cincinnati was early given authority to examine and promote pupils, subject however to a check by an examining committee. In the report for 1858 the superintendent sketched the history of the several attempts to classify the schools.¹ From this history it is evident that the system of classification and promotion lacked uniformity because of the indefinite nature of the grade placement of the materials of the courses of study.² The shortcomings were eliminated through conferences of the principals with the superintendent.³ This same report carries the superintendent's recommendation that promotions from grade to grade and from district to intermediate schools be made semi-annually.⁴ In 1863 the superintendent recommended two examinations per year with printed questions, by which means he believed that the classification would become more uniform and complete.⁵ The report for 1874 again contained an argument for semi-annual promotions, indicating that there had probably been a change to annual promotions between 1863 and 1873.⁶

The superintendent of Cleveland first mentioned his responsibility for promotions in the report of 1855.⁷ It consisted in preparing the questions for examinations which were administered by the principals of the schools.⁸ In 1868 the superintendent discussed a number of pertinent questions on examinations and promotions.⁹ He thought the standards of promotion should be more flexible, but that the increase in flexibility might tend to nullify the principle of graded schools.¹⁰ He stated, in the report for 1877, that plans had been completed for semi-annual

¹Twentieth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, pp. 24-25. Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1858.

²Ibid., p. 24.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 29.

⁵Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, p. 18. Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1863.

⁶Ibid., p. 61, 1874.

⁷Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 28. Cleveland: Board of Education, 1855.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., pp. 53-54, 1868.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 54.

promotions.¹ In 1881 the report gave credit to the semi-annual promotions for having reduced the average age of the pupils who entered high school.² The report for 1885 discussed a scheme of promotion which provided for the use of examinations and teachers' recommendations.³ It was the opinion of the superintendent that this scheme would be difficult to improve.⁴ The report for 1887 mentioned some further refinements of the scheme adopted in 1885.⁵ Finally, in 1894, the report advised that all examinations had been abolished in 1892 and promotions were made solely on the recommendations of the teachers.⁶

The complexity of the early organization of the schools of Boston increased the difficulty of making promotion plans. The influence of tradition was also difficult to overcome in a community which had long held the belief that its system of schools was about as near perfect as could be found. The superintendent in the report for 1862 set up a scale for the promotion of pupils from primary to grammar schools.⁷ The difficulties pointed out in the report for 1862 were multiplied by the unclassified condition of the primary schools.⁸ The teachers were apparently reluctant to promote pupils from the primary to the grammar schools when promotion could be made from a lower to a higher class within the primary schools.⁹ In the report for 1863 the superintendent again commented on the situation discussed the previous year.¹⁰ He added, however, that since the schools were gradually becoming better classified these difficult conditions would soon be alleviated.¹¹

The superintendent, in the report for 1869, took up specifically the promotion problem in the grammar schools.¹² The grammar schools had become broken up into divisions, a division being made up of a section of pupils under a teacher and consisting of pupils of all stages of advancement. This condition made any

¹Ibid., pp. 75-77, 1877.

²Ibid., p. 74, 1881.

³Ibid., pp. 141-43, 1885.

⁴Ibid., p. 143.

⁵Ibid., pp. 72-73, 1887.

⁶Ibid., p. 70, 1894.

⁷Annual Report of the School Committee for Boston, pp. 106-108. Boston: School Committee, 1862.

⁸Ibid., p. 107.

⁹Ibid., p. 108.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 123-25, 1863.

¹¹Ibid., p. 124.

¹²Ibid., pp. 208-15, 1869.

sort of promotion rule difficult to operate.¹ In addition to the division complication, there was also the tendency to pass pupils on a competitive examination because of the crowded condition of the schools.² The examinations were frequently made so difficult that only a few pupils were able to pass them. As a result of the problems indicated, the superintendent proposed to divide the pupils into classes rather than divisions and to make the examination for promotion less difficult.³

Evidence in support of the statement that the superintendents of schools were responsible for the development of plans for the promotion of pupils could be multiplied indefinitely. Two additional cities only will be considered, namely, Portland and Philadelphia, both of which were among the later large cities to elect superintendents of schools. The superintendent of Portland was elected in 1873, and the superintendent of Philadelphia in 1883.

The superintendent of Portland in the report for 1877 made the statement that semi-annual examinations had been established when the schools were graded in 1873.⁴ He further stated that all of the examinations were prepared by the superintendent and that it was an enormous task.⁵ The report for 1878 indicated a continuance of the promotion plans already in existence.⁶ The report for 1879 described a change in the examinations for promotion, which were now prepared by groups of teachers subject to the approval of the superintendent.⁷ The continuance of this plan was referred to in the report for 1882. Finally, in 1896, the superintendent reported that pupils whose work was above a certain average were promoted without a final examination.⁸ The development of the plan for making promotions was, in Portland, at all times, under the direction of the superintendent of schools.

Two years after the superintendent had been elected in Philadelphia, namely, in 1885, he indicated in his annual report that the examinations for promotion were then under his control.⁹

¹Ibid., p. 209.

²Ibid., p. 208.

³Ibid., p. 214.

⁴Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Public Schools of the City of Portland, p. 16. Portland: Board of Education, 1877.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 13, 1878.

⁷Ibid., p. 18, 1879.

⁸Ibid., p. 78, 1897.

⁹Annual Report of the Philadelphia Schools, p. 13. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1885.

The change had been made because it was essential that the individual who directed the work of the teachers should test the results of the work done by them.¹ In 1893 the superintendent reported that he had recommended the abolition of the mid-year examinations in the interest of saving time for instruction.² The mid-year promotions were to be made on the recommendation of the principals and teachers.³ The superintendent further stated that his plan had been unanimously adopted by the board of education.⁴ It will be recalled that the first superintendent of the schools of Philadelphia was not elected until 1883. The lateness of his election seems to indicate an unusual amount of conservatism and tradition inherent in the administrative practices of the schools of Philadelphia. If the superintendent of schools could, in a period of two years, gain control over the promotion machinery, the proof of the need of a superintendent to solve promotion problems seems to be established.

Development of Ungraded Classes

As the system of graded schools developed and the requirements for promotion became more definitely established, it became apparent that there was, in most cities, a group of pupils who did not fit into the graded system. This situation was intensified by the passage of compulsory school attendance laws. The operation of these laws brought into school pupils who either had not attended school at all or who had attended very irregularly. In a number of cities the needs of this group were met by the establishment of ungraded classes or schools.

The intermediate schools of Boston were established in 1820 to provide school facilities for a group of pupils who were beyond the age for admission into the primary schools and were not sufficiently advanced scholastically to be admitted to the grammar schools.⁵ Later, when the primary and grammar schools of Boston were more closely graded, no attempt was made to grade the intermediate schools. A class of schools known as intermediate was established later in a number of cities, but in no other city did they have the same function as in Boston.

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 34-35, 1893.

³Ibid., p. 34.

⁴Ibid., p. 35.

⁵Annals of the Boston Primary School Committee, pp. 52-55.

Boston: School Committee, 1860.

The superintendent of St. Louis in the annual report for 1869, after discussing the advantages and disadvantages of a graded system of schools, recommended that a special school be established for a class of pupils which he called "clinkers."¹ The school recommended by the superintendent and subsequently established was what would today be called a "coaching" or "helping" school, designed to assist those pupils who had become discouraged because of inability to do the work of the grade in which they were placed.

In 1871 New Haven, on the recommendation of a committee of which the superintendent was a member, established a school for truants and incorrigibles.² This provision was made necessary by reason of the enforcement of the truant laws.³ By 1883, according to the report of the superintendent, the number of ungraded classes in New Haven had been increased to five.⁴

The necessity for an ungraded school for bad boys was suggested by the superintendent of Detroit in the report for 1873.⁵ In the report for 1881 he again recommended that ungraded classes be established.⁶ The lack of a compulsory attendance law made the establishment of such classes both difficult and necessary.⁷ Finally, in 1887, the report of the superintendent stated that the special classes had been in operation for a year and had been highly satisfactory.⁸

The difference in mental aptitudes of the pupils and their opportunities for attending school, as well as the necessity for maintaining graded schools, were given as reasons by the superintendent of Milwaukee for recommending the establishment of ungraded schools in 1891.⁹

¹Fifteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, pp. 103-107. St. Louis: Board of Directors, 1869.

²Annual Report of the Board of Education of the New Haven City School District, pp. 19-20. New Haven: Board of Education, 1871.

³Ibid., p. 19.

⁴Ibid., pp. 55-57, 1884.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Detroit, p. 57. Detroit: Board of Education, 1873.

⁶Ibid., p. 52, 1881.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., pp. 39-40, 1887.

⁹Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 62. Milwaukee: Board of Education, 1891.

The superintendent of Columbus recommended in 1882 that special schools be established.¹ He expected such schools to protect the good, reform the bad, and reclaim the truant.² The program of studies, he advised, was largely reformatory and industrial.³

Without going into more detail on the responsibilities of the superintendent for establishing ungraded schools, a list of additional cities, with dates of recommendation, is given:

Providence.....	1888 ⁴
Kansas City.....	1892 ⁵
Cleveland.....	1894 ⁶
Los Angeles.....	1894 ⁷
Philadelphia.....	1898 ⁸
San Francisco.....	1901 ⁹

Summary

The materials of this chapter reveal unmistakable evidence that the work necessary to establish a graded system of schools was done by the early superintendents. They took office when the laymen who had administered the schools up to that time were ready to acknowledge that the problems of school gradation were beyond the capabilities of persons untrained in the management of schools. Moreover, the duties incident to an oversight of the schools interfered with the business interests of the lay members of boards of

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 104. Columbus: Board of Education, 1882.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Providence, p. 24. Providence: School Committee, 1888.

⁵Annual Report of the Kansas City Public Schools, pp. 79-80. Kansas City: Board of Education, 1892.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 79. Cleveland: Board of Education, 1894.

⁷Annual Report of the Board of Education and Superintendent of City Schools with Rules and Regulations of the Public Schools of Los Angeles, p. 60. Los Angeles: Board of Education, 1897.

⁸Annual Report of Board of Education, p. 11. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1898.

⁹Annual Report of Board of Education, p. 62. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1901.

education. The superintendents found the schools in a chaotic state. Teachers were attempting to find time to instruct in one room large numbers of pupils who varied widely both in ability and in achievement. Courses of study in use made only imperfect allocation of work by grades, and standards for promotion were inadequate or entirely lacking.

In many cases it was necessary for the superintendents to convince the boards of education, the teachers, and the public that the creation of the superintendency was really essential. Before a beginning could be made on the problem of gradation, the superintendents frequently found it necessary to ask for alterations of existing buildings and to advise radical changes in the plans for the erection of new buildings. This latter phase of the work was extremely difficult, because the superintendents had little or no authority in the erection of school buildings. The examination, promotion, and classification of pupils, in a number of cities, had for years been a cherished responsibility of lay members of examining committees. The promotion exercises, and frequently the examinations, had been the occasion for putting the schools on dress parade. To modify a procedure which was so deeply intrenched in the customs of the people was a task requiring much skill, tact, and patience. The superintendents apparently persisted in their undertakings and finally were able to substitute what at least approached scientific procedures for the haphazard practices which characterized the efforts of the lay boards of education.

CHAPTER V

THE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SUPERINTENDENT FOR ORGANIZING A PROGRAM OF SUPERVISION

The Nature of Supervision

Of the twenty-six cities whose regulations governing the duties of the first superintendent of schools were analyzed in Chapter II, all except one specified that this officer was to supervise the schools. Twenty-two of the twenty-six cities specified that he was to visit all of the schools. Sixteen indicated that the superintendent was to aid the teachers in discipline. Nine cities directed their first superintendent to superintend the schools. The report of New York for 1855, in mentioning the election of the first superintendent of schools for that city, stated that the board of education would never delegate the power to prescribe rules and regulations to any single officer.¹ The plan of superintendence, the report stated, covered the whole field in respect to a complete survey of the school buildings, the furniture, the apparatus, the classbooks, the furnaces and ventilation, the fuel, and the general economy of the system.² But the power to make rules and regulations defining the policy of the board was not placed in the hands of the superintendent.

The American Institute of Instruction at its session for 1869, held in Boston, passed a series of resolutions relating to supervision.³ According to these resolutions, supervision was meant to include the management of school buildings, the appointment of teachers, the classification of pupils, the order of studies and method of teaching, the examination of results, and all other matters which pertained directly to the interests of the schools.⁴

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, p. 32. New York: Board of Education, 1855.

²Ibid.

³Journal of Proceedings of American Institute of Instruction, p. 26. Portsmouth: American Institute of Instruction, 1869.

⁴Ibid.

The Need for a Special Supervisory Officer

As the schools became more closely and carefully graded, the problems of supervision became more complex and specialized. If the work of one grade was to prepare pupils definitely for the next higher grade, the teaching had to be done with greater care and skill than would suffice when the grade requirements were less definitely stated. The members of the boards of education and of the visiting committees had neither the time nor the training for the constructive supervision required by the internal changes in the schools.

The conditions in Baltimore in 1857 illustrate very definitely the need for a full-time supervisory officer.¹ The school commissioners of Baltimore hoped to be able to manage the supervision of the schools by adding supervisory duties to the regular duties of the school treasurer. But as the number of schools increased, it was found that the treasurer could not give sufficient time to supervision.² The report stated that it had become absolutely necessary that some provision for more regular examinations of the schools be made. If this were not done many of the schools would have to be left to the chances of success that might result merely from the greater or less fidelity and efficiency of the individual teachers. This condition was apparent in 1857 but it was not until 1866 that the two offices of treasurer and superintendent were separated.

The president of the board of education of Cleveland, in the annual report for 1854-1855, frankly admitted that the creation of the position of the superintendent of schools of Cleveland was an experiment.³ After two years of experimentation the position was considered a necessity.⁴ The chief advantage gained was in the supervision afforded by the superintendent;⁵ the schools had become so numerous that it was necessary for someone to devote all of his time to their supervision.⁶ To strengthen his argument the president quoted the views of the secretary of the Massachusetts board of education as well as those of the school committee

¹Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of Public Schools, pp. 31-34. Baltimore: Board of Commissioners, 1857.

²Ibid., p. 32.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 9-10. Cleveland: Board of Education, 1855.

⁴Ibid., p. 9.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

of Danvers, Massachusetts.¹ The experience of the Danvers committee had satisfied them that much better results in supervision were secured when the responsibility was centralized in one man.²

The need for supervision was recognized in Providence in 1838, when the school committee recommended to the city council that a superintendent be elected.³ The reason given in the recommendation was that duties which could be performed only by daily supervision were multiplying.⁴ Two years later, in 1841, the report stated that a new era in the schools had begun with the appointment of a superintendent; the superintendency was designated the "right arm" of the school system.⁵

The president of the board of education of Detroit, in the report for 1863, commented favorably on the appointment of a superintendent for the schools.⁶ The supervisory duties necessary to the successful operation of the schools were too exacting and frequent to be performed by members of committees.⁷ According to the president there had been no reason to regret the step taken or the selection made.⁸

While the necessity for expert supervision seems to have been generally recognized, there was not always unanimity in the matter. Philadelphia chose Alexander D. Bache superintendent of schools in 1841.⁹ The onerous duties of the Central High School made it necessary for Bache to be relieved of his duties as superintendent; and it was not until 1883 that Philadelphia again appointed a superintendent of schools.¹⁰ In the first report, written in 1883, the superintendent referred to the division of sentiment with respect to the necessity for the office.¹¹ His appointment, he said, was secured by the willingness of some of the more earnest members of the board of education to make a trial

¹Ibid., p. 10.

²Ibid.

³Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Providence, p. 17. Providence: School Committee, 1863.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Public Schools of the City of Detroit, Twenty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 7-8. Detroit: Board of Education, 1863.

⁷Ibid., p. 8.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Annual Report of the Board of Education for Philadelphia, pp. 7-8. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1863.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 8.

¹¹Ibid., p. 10, 1883.

of supervision.¹ The teachers, for the most part, were very skeptical about the advisability of the necessity for a supervisory officer.²

In Washington, long after the necessity was proclaimed, the appointment of a superintendent was delayed by the fact that the school trustees were unwilling to have him appointed by the mayor.³ Finally in 1869 the necessary regulations were passed and the first superintendent was appointed.⁴ The first appointee held office one year; he was removed on the charges of inefficiency and insubordination.⁵

Sub-Boards and Visiting Committees

It seems rather anomalous that sub-boards and visiting committees were continued in many places after the schools had been placed in the hands of a superintendent. The superintendents rarely made any reference in their reports to the fact that the continuance of these officers handicapped them in their work. It is difficult, however, to believe that a thoroughly effective program of supervision could be organized as long as some of the supervising functions were performed by lay sub-boards and visiting committees. This type of organization seems to have been more prevalent in the east than in other sections of the country.

In listing the responsibilities of the inspectors of common schools -- two in each ward -- the report of New York for 1863 indicated that the inspectors were to visit the schools twice in each year.⁶ They were charged with the oversight of the school buildings, a duty which, it seems, they might have been capable of performing. So far as supervision was concerned, the inspectors' duties were very definitely stated. They were expected to check on (1) the studies pursued, (2) the progress of the classes, (3) the punctuality of the teachers and pupils, (4) the order and attention, (5) the qualifications of the teachers.⁷ Obviously, the superintendent of schools could not be expected to check on

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Annual Report of School District, p. 60. Washington: Board of Trustees, 1870.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Twenty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, pp. 16-17. New York: Board of Education, 1863.

⁷Ibid., p. 16.

some of these conditions; but there seems to be no good reason why the principal of the school could not do so.

The superintendent of the schools of New York was expected to visit every school at least once in each year.¹ He was to be responsible for (1) government, (2) the course of instruction, books, discipline, and conduct of the schools, (3) the conditions of the schoolhouses, (4) advising with the trustees.² If the superintendent and the trustees could have worked in harmony, conditions might have been tolerable.

With respect to school buildings the local trustees of Cincinnati had much the same duties and powers as had those of New York.³ In addition, the Cincinnati trustees were responsible for filling temporary vacancies in the teaching staff and for making the nominations of principal teachers for the schools.⁴ The regulations provided for frequent visits of the trustees to the schools.⁵

In Cleveland the visiting committees were considered to be of vital importance to the welfare of the schools, according to the report of 1854.⁶ These committees were expected to examine the schools and make suggestions for improvement.⁷ The authority making the report for 1854 insisted that visiting the schools was only half of the work of the committees; the other half was making a report of the visit. The visiting committee plan had not, up to that time, worked satisfactorily in Cleveland. Some committees had done all of the work assigned, some had visited and not reported, and others had neither visited nor reported.

The sub-boards of Washington were given the responsibility of caring for the school property,⁸ and of reporting for dismissal any teachers who were unworthy or unqualified.⁹ The last regulation gave an unusual opportunity for stirring up unrest among the teaching staff as well as for developing a system of patronage. As a result it is not difficult to conceive of the teaching staff

¹Ibid., p. 17.

²Ibid.

³Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, p. 95. Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1857.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 10-11. Cleveland: Board of Education, 1854.

⁷Ibid., p. 10.

⁸Annual Report of Public Schools, p. 60. Washington: Board of Trustees, 1870.

⁹Ibid.

being robbed of its efficient teachers through the political machinations of unscrupulous members of the sub-boards.

As late as 1882 the superintendent of the Providence schools urged that the by-laws governing the visits to and examinations of the schools by the visiting committees be changed.¹ He thought the visits should be made at the beginning and end of the school year rather than in the middle of the year.² Either the superintendent was satisfied with the system as it was or he realized that he was without power to make a radical change.

In Boston the system of examining committees was continued until 1875.³ In that year a regulation was adopted which created a board of supervisors to take over the work formerly done by the lay examining committees.⁴ However, the board of supervisors was made independent of the superintendent of schools.⁵ The final result was that Boston no longer had a responsible head of the school system.⁶

There seems to have been a rather general tendency to refrain from giving the superintendent a free hand in the development of a supervisory program. It is difficult to determine whether this tendency was due to the traditional reluctance of laymen to relinquish responsibilities they had long held, to the supposed or demonstrated inability of the superintendents, or to other causes. It is, however, safe to conclude that the development of the ultimate supervisory program was delayed and hampered by the attempt to maintain both lay and professional supervision.

Supervising Principals

Supervising principalships played an important role in the superintendents' efforts to develop a program of supervision. In some cities the first superintendent found principals already engaged in supervisory duties. In such cases the chief task of the superintendent was that of reorganizing and redirecting the work of the principals. In other cities the office of supervising

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Providence, p. 25. Providence: School Committee, 1882.

²Ibid.

³Report of Boston School Committee, p. 76. Boston: School Committee, 1876.

⁴Ibid., p. 25.

⁵John D. Philbrick, City School Systems of the United States--Circular of Information of Bureau of Education Number One, p. 54. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1885.

⁶Ibid.

principal had not been created, and its creation became one of the tasks in the superintendent's development of a supervisory program.

The superintendent of Boston early advocated the placement of more supervisory authority in the hands of the grammar school principals. In the report for 1866, he reminded the school committee that more than a year had passed since he had recommended that grammar masters be given supervisory responsibility for the primary schools in their districts.¹ The superintendent insisted that the plan was "a remedy for previous remedies" and that the only way to achieve progress was "to apply remedy to remedy."² Two years later, in the report of 1868, the superintendent stated that thirty-two grammar masters of the city had the responsibility of the control and management of the schools.³ Commenting on this organization in 1877, the superintendent expressed the conviction that its establishment had been of incalculable value to the supervisory program of the school system.⁴

The superintendent of Chicago improved rather than established supervisory principalships. In the report for 1859, the superintendent asked that some definite regulation be adopted in connection with the supervisory duties of principals⁵ to correct the lack of uniformity in their practices.⁶ Some of them were setting aside definite time for the supervision of their schools; but others were reluctant to leave their teaching duties long enough to supervise the work of the lower classes. The next year, 1860, the superintendent reported that head assistants had been appointed in two of the larger schools.⁷ The head assistant took charge of the principal's classes for a part of each day, thus giving the principal free time for supervision.⁸ Another change made possible by the establishment of the position of head assistant was the abolition of the primary principalships.⁹ The grammar school principals were now placed in charge of the primary

¹Report of the School Committee, pp. 154-55. Boston: School Committee, 1866.

²Ibid., p. 155.

³Ibid., p. 176, 1868.

⁴Ibid., p. 90, 1877.

⁵Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 43. Chicago: Board of Education, 1859.

⁶Ibid., p. 44.

⁷Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 21. Chicago: Board of Education, 1860.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., p. 20.

schools in their districts. By 1863, head assistants had been appointed for twelve of the schools.¹ The superintendent was certain that the change had produced very beneficial results.² The only shortcoming apparent was the tendency for some of the principals to use their free time to give extra instruction to the class for which they were responsible rather than to supervise the remainder of their schools.³

The report of Chicago for 1867 suggested a further extension of the position of head assistant.⁴ In this report the superintendent recommended that sub-masters be appointed in all of the grammar schools.⁵ Such appointments, he felt, would enable the principals of the grammar schools to become responsible for the supervision of all of the schools in their districts.⁶ The recommendation of the superintendent was referred to the board committee on appointment of teachers.⁷ The next year, 1868, this committee made a favorable report on the superintendent's suggestion.⁸ The duties of the principals, head assistants, and assistants or teachers were definitely enumerated in the regulations published in 1872.⁹ The duties of the principals were entirely administrative and supervisory in nature;¹⁰ the principals were relieved of all responsibilities of teaching. The regulations provided for a monthly meeting of all principals with the superintendent.¹¹ These meetings, in the opinion of the superintendent, were of inestimable value to the effective functioning of the supervisory organization of the school system.¹²

Building principals were appointed in Louisville in 1859, twenty-two years after the first superintendent had been elected. As with most of the other changes made in the administrative policies of the Louisville schools, the superintendent apparently had little voice in this readjustment.

¹Ibid., p. 27, 1863.

²Ibid., p. 39.

³Ibid., p. 38.

⁴Ibid., p. 15, 1867.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 16.

⁸Ibid., pp. 186-88, 1868.

⁹Ibid., pp. 243-45, 1872.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 243.

¹¹Ibid., p. 244.

¹²Seventeenth Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 113. Chicago: Board of Education, 1874.

In the report for 1860 the superintendent of Louisville referred to the appointment of a supervising principal for each building as one of the wisest actions ever taken by the board of education.¹ Previous to the appointment of the principals, according to the superintendent, each teacher had felt an independence which militated against the proper management of the schools.² In 1862 the rules governing the duties of the principals were drawn up.³ These rules gave the principals the responsibility for administering and supervising their schools.⁴ They were required to make monthly reports to the secretary of the school district.⁵ One hour in each day was to be spent in supervision when the enrolment was under four hundred, and when the enrolment exceeded four hundred the principals were to devote half of their time to supervision.⁶ In the report for 1864, the superintendent recommended that the principals be relieved of all teaching duties.⁷ He felt confident, on the basis of two years' experience, that a principal could not successfully teach a class and devote one half of his time to supervision.⁸

In 1871 when the task of examining all of the pupils of the schools of New Haven became too arduous for the superintendent, this function was passed down to the principals.⁹ The superintendent, in the report for 1872, commented on the splendid success which had marked the first year of the readjustment.¹⁰ The grammar school principals had been given responsibility for the supervision of instruction in all of the schools in their sub-districts.¹¹ The advantages were summarized by the superintendent in the report for 1872, and he was convinced after a trial of one year that the arrangement should be extended and continued.¹² In commenting on

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 26. Louisville: Board of Education, 1860.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 28-29, 1862.

⁴Ibid., p. 28, 1860.

⁵Ibid., p. 29.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Annual Report of the Louisville School District, p. 28. Louisville: Board of Trustees, 1864.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Annual Report of the Board of Education of the New Haven City School District, pp. 28-31. New Haven: Board of Education, 1872.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 29.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid., p. 31.

the desirability of having principals in the report for 1877, the superintendent declared that the movement was of vital significance in the development of the school system.¹ In the first place, he said, the principalship had developed into a position of real value to the school system, and in the second place the superintendent had been relieved of duties which really belonged to the principal.²

Earlier reference was made in this chapter to the continuance of sub-boards in Washington after the superintendent of the Washington schools, in the report for 1872, made the statement that the time had arrived when supervision should be placed in the hands of persons trained for the work.³ He recommended the election of supervising principals to have supervisory control over the school districts of the city.⁴ Early in 1873 the board of trustees was reduced from twenty to eight and the recommendation of the superintendent was adopted.⁵ The report for 1874-1875 contained the regulations set up for governing the activities of the supervising principals.⁶ Under these regulations the supervising principals were designated local superintendents of all the schools in their respective districts and given complete charge under the direction of the superintendent.⁷

The Cincinnati plan of supervising principals was frequently referred to by the superintendents of other cities. It should be recalled that one of the obligations of the early superintendent was that he become informed concerning the school systems in other places. The report of the superintendent for 1857 gave a somewhat detailed account of the duties and responsibilities of the principals.⁸ They were made responsible for the instruction, discipline, and management of their schools.⁹ The report of the schools for 1861 contained the rules and regulations set up for the guidance of the principals, or local superintendents, as they

¹Ibid., pp. 38-40, 1877.

²Ibid., p. 40.

³Twenty-sixth Report of the Board of Trustees of Public Schools of the City of Washington, pp. 36-37. Washington: Board of Trustees, 1873.

⁴Ibid., p. 37.

⁵Ibid., p. 28, 1873.

⁶Ibid., p. 308, 1874-75.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Annual Report of the Public Schools of Cincinnati, pp. 86-87. Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1858.

⁹Ibid., p. 87.

were sometimes called.¹ There is no doubt as to the intention of placing authority in the hands of the principals, since they were given complete control over the schools and were relieved from a part of their former duties as teachers.²

Minneapolis had an interesting experience in the development of its supervisory program. For a number of years the principals of the buildings were responsible for the supervision.³ Later two special supervisors were added, but it was found that there was a conflict of interests and authority between these supervisors and the principals.⁴ In 1891, the supervisors were relieved of their duties and the principals were again given responsibility for supervision.⁵ The superintendent, in the report for 1898, recommended that the principals be given supervisory control over several buildings.⁶ His argument was that the work would be more uniform and less expensive.⁷ Apparently this change was not made, as in the report for 1901 mention was made of a change in the duties of the principals;⁸ an assistant principal was allowed for each building of ten rooms or less.⁹ The principals of the schools for which the assistants were allowed were required to teach for one half of each day.¹⁰ This change, it was said, saved \$3,500 annually and was thought to be the best plan yet adopted.¹¹

One more account of the efforts of the superintendent to establish a program of supervision through the agency of supervising principals will be given. San Francisco, in 1860, eight years after the election of the first superintendent, had an unusual supervisory situation. The superintendent, in the report for 1860, referred to the fact that on recommendation the department principalships had been abolished.¹² There had been a separate

¹Ibid., pp. 64-65, 1861.

²Ibid., p. 65.

³Fifteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Minneapolis, p. 8. Minneapolis: Board of Education, 1891.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 73, 1898.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., p. 71, 1901.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid., p. 72.

¹²Department of Public Instruction. Tenth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Common Schools of San Francisco, p. 5. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1860.

principal for each department in each building of the school system. The organization, the superintendent said, had been expensive and inefficient in that it emphasized the vertical gradation of the schools.¹ In the report for 1863 the superintendent recommended that the grammar masters be relieved of teaching and given supervisory powers over their schools.² In making this recommendation he referred to the practices in operation in New York and Boston.³ The grammar masters in New York were freed entirely from teaching and those in Boston were given an assistant. The report for 1868 gave the information that the grammar masters had been given some supervisory duties.⁴ In the same report reference was made to the duties of the primary principalships. Evidently the grammar masters had not yet been placed in charge of all the schools in their districts.⁵ By 1870, the grammar masters, according to the report of the superintendent, had been given charge of both the grammar and primary schools of their districts.⁶ The superintendent stressed the importance of selecting only strong and well-trained persons for the positions of grammar masters.⁷ The report for 1875 mentioned the success of the system and again urged that none but the most competent be employed as principals or "so-called" grammar masters.⁸

Assistant Superintendents

Philadelphia is the only city in the country where assistant superintendents were elected at the same time as the first superintendent. In the other cities the assistant superintendents were appointed when it was felt that the duties of the superintendents were too numerous and complex to be discharged by one man. Four assistant superintendents were elected in Philadelphia at the same time that the first superintendent was elected in 1883, and the superintendent was given the duty of planning the work to be done by the assistants.⁹ The plan finally agreed upon

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 25, 1863-64.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 49, 1868.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., pp. 47-49, 1870.

⁷Ibid., p. 48.

⁸Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, pp. 51-52. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1875.

⁹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, p. 14. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1883.

divided the city into two districts and assigned a man and a woman to each district.¹ The man was made responsible for the supervision of the grammar schools and the woman for that of the primary schools.²

New York found it necessary to appoint assistant superintendents at an early date. Four years after the office of superintendent was created two assistants were appointed.³ The reasons given for the appointment were that the labors of visiting the schools, examining the teachers, and other supervisory duties were too numerous for one man to perform.⁴ One assistant was assigned to the grammar schools, the other to the primary schools, and the superintendent was made responsible for discharging the general duties of the office.⁵ In 1857, six years after the position of superintendent was created, a third assistant superintendent was elected.⁶ According to the views of the president of the board of education, the chief duty of the superintendents was the examination of the schools.⁷ These examinations to be most effective, the president thought, should be given without previous notice.⁸

Chicago in 1869 elected its first assistant superintendent of schools, his title being assistant to the superintendent of schools.⁹ The assistant was given the general oversight of the independent primary schools and the supervision of the work of substitute teachers.¹⁰ The primary departments of the schools had not been so closely graded as they should have been and it was felt that the work of the assistant superintendent would help to rectify that deficiency.¹¹ Apparently the first assistant elected was not satisfactory and at the beginning of the second year he was transferred to a teaching position in the high school and another principal was elected assistant to the superintendent.¹²

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, p. 31. New York: Board of Education, 1855.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., pp. 78-79, 1857.

⁷Ibid., p. 79.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Sixteenth Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 112-13. Chicago: Board of Education, 1870.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 112.

¹¹Ibid., p. 113.

¹²Seventeenth Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 127. Chicago: Board of Education, 1871.

The duties remained the same for the second man chosen.¹

After the Chicago fire the office of assistant to the superintendent was abolished for one year.² In 1872 the position was again established and the title changed to assistant superintendent of schools.³ In 1880 the superintendent asked for two or three additional assistants.⁴ He insisted that the increase in help was necessary if the teaching was to be properly supervised.⁵ When he made the request the superintendent referred to the fact that in New York and Boston an assistant superintendent was allowed for every 100,000 inhabitants.⁶ His request was granted in 1882, Chicago then had a superintendent and two assistants to do the supervisory work of the schools. In 1885 the president of the board of education advocated the appointment of two additional assistant superintendents.⁷ The president was anxious, he said, to reduce the itinerant feature of the work of the superintendents.⁸ He felt that they needed more time for deliberation on the work of the school system.⁹ By 1888 the number of assistant superintendents had been increased to five.¹⁰ The report for 1888 suggested that the superintendent be relieved of all responsibility for visiting schools and spend his time in the office.¹¹ Later in the 1888 report the plan of supervisory organization was explained. The schools were divided vertically and one of the assistants was assigned to each division;¹² but a provision that each assistant visit all of the schools in the city at least once in each year was made in order that he might gain a conception of the entire system.¹³ The superintendent was satisfied that this plan of organization of the supervision was the most beneficial one that could have been adopted.¹⁴ This plan of organization grew in later years into the well-defined district system which is in operation in Chicago at the present time.

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 41-42, 1879.

³Ibid., p. 42.

⁴Ibid., p. 38, 1880.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., pp. 19-20, 1885.

⁸Ibid., p. 19.

⁹Ibid., p. 20.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 18, 1888.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid., p. 71.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 72.

In Providence the first assistant superintendent was elected in 1888.¹ Here, as in the other cities mentioned, the conviction prevailed that the superintendent did not have time to supervise capably all the schools.² The idea also prevailed in Providence that making grammar schoolmasters responsible for division was only a temporary measure.³ The ordinance which provided for the assistant superintendent gave the superintendent the power of selection.⁴

St. Louis also shifted its plan of supervisory organization from supervision by principals to supervision by assistant superintendents. The report for 1891 stated that the principals had been again placed in charge of their own schools and that the two assistant superintendents had been increased to three.⁵ This number, according to the president of the board of education, could very capably handle the problems of supervision.⁶ By 1903 the principals were again given more authority in their schools and were made intermediaries between the assistant superintendents and the teachers.⁷

In the report for 1867 the superintendent of San Francisco, after writing at considerable length on the complexity of his duties, requested that he be given an assistant.⁸ The business duties of his office, he insisted, prevented him from performing the more legitimate and appropriate duties of visiting schools.⁹ By 1874 the deputy superintendent had been appointed and his duties, which were almost entirely supervisory in nature, were defined.¹⁰ The deputy, according to the rules, was to act under the general direction of the superintendent, but an examination of the regulations governing his office reveals that he was very definitely responsible to the board committee on classification.¹¹

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Providence, pp. 11-13. Providence: School Committee, 1888.

²Ibid., p. 11.

³Ibid., p. 12.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, p. 14. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1891.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., pp. 235-36, 1903.

⁸Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, pp. 63-65. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1867.

⁹Ibid., pp. 64-65.

¹⁰Rules of the Board of Education and Regulations of the Public Schools, pp. 16-17. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1874.

¹¹Ibid.

The regulations specified that the deputy was to have, under the direction of the committee on classification, the direction of the annual examination of the grammar schools. On request he was to make to the committee on classification a written report on the examination, and at the close of the school year the deputy was to make a written report to this committee. The report was to include a record of his school visits, the results of the examinations, and the condition of the schools generally.

San Francisco had, for a period of years, a type of supervision which was unique. The superintendent was not an advocate of the plan, but it had so much influence on the program of supervision in San Francisco that it should be mentioned. In 1885 the board of education created the office of head inspector of schools.¹ This official worked under the direction of the board committee on classification. He was a sort of quasi-superintendent and, in fact, had more power over the teachers than the superintendent.² After several differences which resulted in court cases the head inspector, to come within the law, was nominally placed under the direction of the superintendent,³ but he continued to function as the agent of the committee on classification.⁴ Over a period of four years between fifty and one hundred teachers were driven out of the schools rather than face a public investigation before a packed jury.⁵ The teachers were terrorized because they did not know when they might be compelled to stand trial before the committee on classification, one teacher committing suicide.⁶ Finally the Supreme Court of California revoked the legislation which had made the office of head inspector possible.⁷ The superintendent in reporting the practices of the head inspector did so because he felt that public opinion would demand a discontinuance of the office if the facts were known.

In Cincinnati no assistant superintendents were appointed until 1901.⁸ This was no doubt due to the fact that Cincinnati had so thoroughly developed the plan of supervision by principals.

¹Annual Report of the Public Schools of the City and County of San Francisco, pp. 130-32. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1892.

²Ibid., p. 132.

³Ibid., pp. 131-32.

⁴Ibid., p. 132.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Seventy-third Annual Report of the Public Schools, p. 41. Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1902.

One of the two assistant superintendents appointed was given charge of the German schools and the English schools in the German districts.¹ The other was given supervision over the remaining English schools.² At the close of the first year of service the superintendent felt that the assistant superintendents had been of inestimable value to the school system.³

Institutes and Teachers' Meetings

It has been the purpose of this chapter, up to this point, to show that one of the reasons for the employment of a superintendent was to develop a program of supervision. This task was made more difficult because of the existence of lay committees which had been accustomed to exercise supervisory duties over the schools. In the development of his program the superintendent made use of supervising and district principals and of assistant superintendents. The remainder of the chapter will be devoted to a consideration of institutes and teachers' meetings as a means of supervision, with some mention of the position of special teachers.

Thirteen of the twenty-six cities in which those regulations governing the original duties of the superintendent were analyzed indicated that the officer was expected to hold teachers' meetings. In some cities the number and time of the meetings were specified; in others the superintendent was allowed a great deal of initiative in developing his program of meetings.

The superintendent of Columbus began his teachers' meetings in 1847 before school had opened for the first year of his incumbency.⁴ Instructions in the proper mode of organizing, classifying and governing schools, and in the best methods of teaching and illustrating the several studies of the curriculum were given to the teachers.⁵ The members of the board of education attended the last of these meetings and the president instructed the teachers in the regulations of the schools.⁶ Teachers' meetings were continued during the next school year. The report of the superintendent for 1849 states that the meetings were held during

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 14-15.

Columbus: Board of Education, 1848.

⁵Ibid., p. 14.

⁶Ibid.

the whole of every alternate Saturday.¹ The superintendent believed that more could be accomplished by holding the meetings for the whole of alternate Saturdays than by holding them for one-half of each Saturday.² The teachers contributed papers written on the methods of teaching the various subjects and on methods of discipline.³ In the report of 1850 the superintendent mentioned the continuance of these meetings on the same plan as described for the previous year.⁴ In 1875, according to the report of the superintendent, an institute was held preceding the opening of the school term.⁵ The work of the institute was intended to prepare the teachers for duties of the year.⁶ The teachers of music and drawing were present to outline yearly plans for their work.⁷ He felt that the sessions of the institute had been very helpful to the work of the teachers.⁸ Later, as the principals came to have more authority and responsibility for the supervision of the schools, they were required to conduct the teachers' meetings.⁹ In 1873 the superintendent reported that forty-two teachers' meetings had been held during the year.¹⁰ At these meetings the work for the month was assigned to the principals, who in turn gave the assignments to their schools.¹¹ It seems apparent that by 1898 the superintendent was chiefly concerned with principals' meetings.¹² In his report for 1898 he wrote of monthly meetings of principals and of a principals' association which met monthly to discuss questions of importance to the school system.

The practice of holding teachers' meetings as part of the supervisory program was not confined to the older cities.¹³ The superintendent of Portland in the third annual report, 1876, referred to a teachers' institute which had been held in compliance with a ruling of the board of education and which was apparently

¹Ibid., p. 27, 1849-50.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 40, 1850-51.

⁵Ibid., pp. 43-44, 1875.

⁶Ibid., p. 43.

⁷Ibid., p. 44.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., p. 90, 1873.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 89.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 89-90.

¹²Ibid., p. 113, 1898.

¹³Third Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Public Schools, p. 35. Portland: Board of Education, 1876.

not in high favor with the teaching staff.¹ By 1894 meetings of the teachers had been increased to a much larger number. In that year the superintendent reported two general meetings, eleven principals' meetings, and ten grade meetings.² He was satisfied that the meetings had assisted in producing better results in the teaching of several of the subjects of the elementary curriculum.³ In addition to the meetings mentioned, each principal held weekly teachers' meetings.⁴

In another of the younger cities, Denver, the superintendent in giving an account of his meetings for 1876, mentioned two series of conferences.⁵ The superintendent met the teachers of each building weekly for a conference on matters pertaining to the better operation of the building.⁶ In addition he met the teachers by grades on the first, second, and third Saturdays of each month.⁷ The superintendent felt that Denver 'had a distinct advantage in teachers' meetings by reason of having teachers in the system from widely scattered colleges and normal schools.

The superintendent of Atlanta, reporting in 1876, expressed satisfaction with the system of teachers' meetings as conducted in the schools. The teachers met on Saturday mornings to discuss methods of instruction and at other times as a normal class.⁸ In the normal class the teachers studied some subject outside the ordinary school curriculum.⁹ Evidently an attempt was being made to extend the cultural background of the teachers. The superintendent felt that the meetings of the normal class were valuable to the teachers in improving their discipline and culture.¹⁰

The Rochester teachers' institute was reorganized in 1856.¹¹ Under the new plan the sessions were divided in the

¹Ibid.

²Annual Report of the City Superintendent of Public Schools, p. 57. Portland: Board of Education, 1894.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education of District Number One, with Rules and Courses of Study, p. 26. Denver: Board of Education, 1876.

⁶Ibid., pp. 26-27.

⁷Ibid., p. 27.

⁸Fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 18. Atlanta: Board of Education, 1876.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Annual Report of the Rochester School District, p. 21. Rochester: Board of Education, 1856.

following manner: fifteen minutes of opening exercises, fifty minutes to class exercises during which the teachers retired to classrooms and engaged in a lesson in English composition and rhetoric. After the lesson the teachers returned to the lecture room for an address delivered by one of the men teachers; later essays were read by the women teachers.¹ The meetings were held on alternate Saturdays from ten o'clock until noon.²

The superintendent of New Haven reported forty teachers' meetings held under his direction during the school year 1865-1866.³ The list of topics shows a range of subjects of practical interest to teachers.⁴ The method of holding the meetings varied. Sometimes oral discussion was held and at other times prepared papers were read.⁵

As the school systems increased in size and complexity of organization, it became necessary for the superintendents to modify their plans for holding teachers' meetings and institutes. The types of meetings will be traced in several of the larger cities.

The superintendent of Chicago in the first report issued in 1854 mentioned holding a teachers' institute.⁶ The meetings were held, after the schools had all been graded and classified, for the purpose of perfecting and unifying the system.⁷ The sessions were held on the first and second Saturdays of each month in the autumn, winter, and spring.⁸ By 1862 the number of teachers had become so large that it was necessary to divide them into sections for the purpose of conducting the institute.⁹ During the first part of the session the teachers were instructed in one group; during the second part they were divided into five sections according to their teaching interests.¹⁰ The management of the program was left to the superintendent, who called on the teachers for help.¹¹ The superintendent felt that the teachers had more

¹Ibid., p. 22.

²Ibid.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education of the New Haven City School District, p. 32. New Haven: Board of Education, 1866.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶First Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Chicago Schools, p. 8. Chicago: Board of Education, 1854.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., pp. 16-18, 1862.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 17.

¹¹Ibid.

interest in the meetings when they helped to plan the programs.¹

In his report for 1874 the superintendent mentioned the value of the principals' association which had been formed a few years earlier.² The influence of this association had been a big factor in fostering friendly feelings, awakening thought, encouraging instruction, and cementing diverse interests.³ In addition to the meetings of the principals' association, an institute was held by grades as often as once in five weeks.⁴ The greater part of the time was given over to the discussion of methods of teaching reading, writing, and arithmetic.⁵ The attendance of the teachers was voluntary in marked contrast to the obligatory attendance of a few years earlier.⁶ By 1892 the superintendent had ceased to hold meetings of teachers himself. Four types of meetings held thereafter were described. The superintendent met the principals once each month for a discussion of educational principles and theories.⁷ The division superintendents held two meetings for the purpose of giving the teachers specific instruction in the studies of the grades, together with teaching aids.⁸ The principals held one meeting each month with the teachers of their buildings, at which questions of school management and government were studied.⁹ The fourth type of meeting was the departmental conferences held by the high school teachers.¹⁰ The superintendent, because of increasing pressure of duties, had gradually developed a diversified program to meet the needs of the various groups of teachers in the schools.

In 1856 the teachers of Cincinnati were assembled once each month, at the call of the superintendent.¹¹ They assembled by grades or groups of grades and the principals assembled in a separate meeting.¹² The chief purposes of the meetings, according

¹Ibid., p. 18.

²Ibid., pp. 113-15, 1874.

³Ibid., p. 114.

⁴Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Chicago Schools, p. 114. Chicago: Board of Education, 1874.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 115.

⁷Ibid., pp. 34-36, 1892.

⁸Ibid., pp. 34-35.

⁹Ibid., p. 35.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 36.

¹¹Annual Report of the Trustees and Visitors of Common Schools, pp. 48-49. Cincinnati: Board of Trustees and Visitors, 1856.

¹²Ibid., p. 48.

to the superintendent, were improving methods of instruction and maintaining an esprit de corps among the teachers.¹ The meetings were of three kinds: (1) lectures on the theory and practice of teaching, (2) demonstration teaching, (3) discussion of the lecture or the demonstration lesson. The report for 1857 indicated a continuance of the meeting described for 1856.² In the report for 1869 the superintendent indicated that he relied largely on the principals to influence the character of the instruction and management of the schools.³ He also mentioned the good influence of the principals' association, which met weekly.⁴ At these meetings measures which would render the work of the schools more efficient were discussed and explained.⁵ Special meetings were held for the consideration of special questions of pressing importance.⁶ By 1901 the superintendent was convinced that the most effective work performed by the principals was the holding of conferences with their teachers.⁷ He was much gratified to find that a large number of schools were studying professional problems. Most of the schools held meetings monthly, a few semi-monthly, and twelve schools held meetings weekly.⁸

Effect of Introduction of New Subjects into the Curriculum of the Schools

As new subjects were introduced into the school curriculum it frequently became necessary to elect special teachers of these subjects. This was particularly true of art and music. Later, as the school systems increased in size, these special teachers became supervisors of the subjects in which they had special training.

Instruction in vocal music was first introduced into the schools of Chicago in 1842, with a special teacher to take charge of the instruction.⁹ In 1843 the opposition to the teaching of music was so strong that it was discontinued and the teacher was

¹Ibid., p. 49.

²Ibid., p. 41, 1857.

³Ibid., p. 47, 1869.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 48.

⁷Ibid., pp. 48-49, 1901.

⁸Ibid., p. 49.

⁹Fourth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, p. 13. Chicago: Board of Education, 1858.

dismissed.¹ The teaching of music was reestablished in Chicago, under a special teacher, in 1848.

The superintendent of the Milwaukee schools, in the report for 1873, stated that since the board had decided to adopt instruction in art and music it had been necessary to employ a man as instructor in each of these subjects.²

Among the recommendations of the superintendent of New York in the report for 1857 was one suggesting that instruction in vocal music be provided for the schools.³ This could be done, in the opinion of the superintendent, by the employment of such professors and teachers and the purchase of such instruments as were necessary.⁴

In the report for 1872 the superintendent of the Detroit schools suggested that since there was only one teacher of writing and one of vocal music their efforts should be confined to a few grades rather than be spread over the entire school system.⁵ His specific recommendation was that writing be taught to the higher grades and music to the lower grades.⁶ In the same report the superintendent recommended that a special teacher of reading and elocution be employed.⁷ He also pointed out that in the near future the people of Detroit would demand that special teachers of drawing be employed.⁸ In the report for 1884-1885 the superintendent compared the teaching of penmanship, drawing, music, and arithmetic with that of geography and history.⁹ It was his conviction, based on experience, that penmanship, drawing, and music were better taught by specially trained teachers than by the regular grade teachers.¹⁰ He therefore recommended the employment of special teachers of penmanship, drawing, and music.

¹Ibid.

²Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners to His Honor the Mayor and Common Council of Milwaukee, p. 40. Milwaukee: Board of School Commissioners, 1873.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, p. 23. New York: Board of Education, 1857.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 63. Detroit: Board of Education, 1872.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., pp. 73-74, 1884-85.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 74.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to point out some of the procedures used by the early superintendents in developing a program of supervision. The supervision of the schools was one of the requirements imposed by the regulations governing the activities and duties of the early superintendents. The development of a graded system of schools, discussed in Chapter III, could not have been consummated unless the superintendents had been given the authority to supervise the work of the schools. The necessity for supervision was intensified by reason of the number of changes which were being made in the gradation of the schools and the courses of study. It is not to be supposed that all of these changes were made before the supervisory program was launched. The new gradation, the allocation of materials to the several grades, the development of new courses of study, the formulation of standards for promotion and the organization of a program of supervision had to be done more or less concurrently. The evidence indicates that not all of the proposals were received enthusiastically by the teachers. In many cases the supervisory staff had little or no responsibility in the selection of teachers. This condition served to magnify and intensify the problems incident to the development of a program of supervision. Another factor which served to complicate the problem was the continuance of lay committees with responsibility for inspection and supervision.

As the school systems grew and the duties of the superintendent increased in scope and magnitude, it was necessary for the supervisory staff to be increased. Help was secured through several agencies. In some cities the principals of the grammar schools were relieved of part or all of their teaching duties and given some supervisory responsibilities. The authority of the principals was, in some cases, extended to all of the schools located in a given section of the city. Assistant superintendents were employed in most cities studied and the supervision of the schools was allocated to members of the superintendent's staff. In both cases the superintendent was relieved of the responsibility for making close contact with the schoolroom teaching. The responsibility for holding teachers' meetings was also assigned to members of the superintendent's staff. All of these measures which relieved the superintendent of routine duties gave him more time to plan for the improvement and growth of the school system.

The materials of the chapter present convincing evidence that the superintendent originated, developed, directed, and controlled the program of supervision set up in the city school systems.

CHAPTER VI

HOW THE SUPERINTENDENT BECAME THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

The Board of Education

The administrative control which early boards of education exercised over the schools was relinquished slowly and apprehensively. The new administrative officer, the superintendent of schools, was not immediately clothed with all of the executive and administrative power which had been exercised by the boards of education. In fact, some superintendents were not given any of the major administrative functions. In the last analysis, the board of education is the authority responsible to the electorate; the superintendent of schools is merely the agent of the board of education. School boards are, for the most part, legally empowered to delegate duties to the superintendent; but until the delegation has been made, the superintendent may not perform the duties entrusted to the board of education.

The administrative control exercised by the early boards of education had been accumulated through years of practice. In some cases elaborate organizations had been developed to carry out the administrative functions. The boards of education did not feel incompetent to conduct all of the affairs of the school system. They admitted the need of help in some of the purely educational phases of school administration. Moreover, the early superintendents had not been experienced in or trained for all the ramifications of public school administration. They were often only successful classroom teachers and were expected to be able to speak and act authoritatively and effectively only on matters pertaining to teaching.

The elaborate organizations of school boards which were in existence when the first superintendents were elected became still more elaborate as the size and complexities of the school systems increased. Boards of education and their committees continued to exercise both legislative and executive functions. The function of a directing board has now come to be considered as being primarily legislative. The many problems arising out of the operation of a public school system are too complex and detailed to be solved by citizens who are chosen or elected to act in the

capacity of school board members. A professionally trained executive should be employed to administer the policies adopted and approved by the board.

Radical changes had to be made in the existing and developing modes of organization of boards of education before the superintendent was in reality the executive officer of the school system. These changes were, of necessity, made slowly and in the face of strenuous opposition on the part of those who had been accustomed both to legislate and to administer. This chapter traces some of the problems with which the superintendent had to deal before he acquired the right to be called the executive officer of the board of education.

Methods of Appointment and Length of Term of Members of Boards of Education

Brief tenure of members of boards of education was, without doubt, a severe handicap to the development of constructive educational policies and programs. Added to the handicap of inadequate tenure, was that of the definite political methods of selecting the personnel of the boards. As long as members of boards of education were elected annually or biennially by wards on party issues there was slight possibility of securing a continuing organization which would make practicable the development of a forward-looking program of activities that could be carried out over a period of years. Brief tenure for boards of education meant short tenure for the superintendents of schools. There appeared to be an aversion, on the part of boards of education, to the selection of officers for terms longer than their own. The brief tenure of superintendents gave those officers little chance to be more than opportunists in school administration. The lack of reasonable security of tenure meant that the superintendents were concerned chiefly with those problems whose solution enhanced their standing with the political powers of the community. The instability of the organization engendered by brief tenure precluded the establishment of a vital and functioning status for the superintendent of schools.

A most vivid portrayal of the unsatisfactory selection of members of boards of education is contained in the report of the San Francisco superintendent for 1867.¹ Not only was the entire board of education in San Francisco elected annually by popular

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, pp. 58-61. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1867.

vote, but the superintendent was also elected in the same manner.¹ The method of handling the routine business of the school district was unsatisfactory.² The disbursement of money had to come before the whole board for discussion, he referred to a committee, later be reported back to the board, and the account ordered paid.³ Cases of discipline of pupils, no matter how trifling, might be discussed by the entire board.⁴ The selection of teachers was discussed in open board meetings.⁵ The superintendent proposed to ameliorate the conditions by increasing the size of the board of education and by giving committees the power to act finally in matters of minor importance.⁶ By 1885 the length of term of directors had been increased to two years, but many of the political conditions still existed.⁷ Two charters, which contained provisions to reorganize the school administration, had been submitted to popular vote and had been defeated.⁸ In the report for 1896 the superintendent of San Francisco suggested that the schools could be partially removed from politics by changing the method of election of the board.⁹ He recommended that instead of electing the entire board biennially the mayor should appoint a board of seven members for terms of four years, with terms so arranged that ultimately they would expire at different dates.¹⁰

The situation in Rochester, according to the report of the superintendent for 1858, was similar to that in San Francisco.¹¹ The entire board of education was elected annually and the superintendent was elected by the board for a term of one year.¹² The board was composed of twenty-one members with no authority resting in any committee or individual and with the possibility of passing responsibilities from one to the other without their ever becoming fixed.¹³ The board, according to the view of the superintendent, was not a legislative body but merely an advisory organization

¹Ibid., p. 58.

²Ibid., p. 60.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 61.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., pp. 65-66, 1885.

⁸Ibid., p. 66.

⁹Ibid., p. 9, 1896.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools of the City of Rochester, pp. 9-14. Rochester: Board of Education, 1858.

¹²Ibid., p. 9.

¹³Ibid.

which should help to execute the methods of practical education that would promote the best interests of the schools.¹ Evidently the plan of school board election proposed by the superintendent was given favorable consideration by the law makers. From 1858 until 1900 the board of education of Rochester was organized on the basis of ward representation,² each ward being represented by one man who served for a term of two years.³

In February, 1869 the term of members of the board of education of Detroit was fixed by law at two years, with half of the membership elected each year by wards.⁴ Vacancies were to be filled by the city council on nominations by the mayor. The mayor and recorder of the city were ex officio members of the board of education.⁵ The president of the board in the report for 1880 mentioned a situation which had developed out of the ward method of selection and organization.⁶ The chief argument advanced for the ward method of election had been that each ward would be assured a representative to look after its interests. By 1880 one of the wards had no school buildings and had only one hundred seventy-nine pupils, while another ward had several school buildings and 5,719 pupils.⁷ Each ward had the same representation on the board of education. Another undesirable situation had arisen in the matter of school buildings which had been erected in the wards without regard to necessity, proper location, or suitability of site.⁸ The president was not certain regarding the best means of rectifying the situation. One suggestion was to choose the directors at large and lengthen the term of office.⁹ This measure, the president felt, would likely place the board of education in politics and he was averse to having that happen.¹⁰ In March, 1881 the act of 1869 relative to the free schools of Detroit was amended.¹¹

¹Ibid., pp. 10-11.

²Ibid., p. 30, 1899.

³Ibid.

⁴Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 92. Detroit: Board of Education, 1869.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., pp. 7-9, 1880.

⁷Ibid., p. 8.

⁸Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 8. Detroit: Board of Education, 1880.

⁹Ibid., pp. 8-9.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 9.

¹¹An Act Relative to Free Schools in the City of Detroit (Approved Feb. 24, 1869 As Amended March 1891) secs. 2 and 7. Thirty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City with Accompanying Documents, pp. 141-42. Detroit: Board of Education, 1882.

Under the amended act the board of education was made up of twelve inspectors elected at large for terms of four years, the election being held at the time of the regular city elections.¹ The votes cast for school inspectors were to be deposited in separate ballot boxes.² Evidently the president's fear that the election at large might place the board in politics was not without justification.

The original board of education of Cleveland, called "The Board of Managers of Common Schools in the City of Cleveland," was appointed by the common council for a term of one year.³ The president of the board in the report for 1884 suggested that the members should be elected for terms of three years, one-third annually.⁴ He felt that this arrangement would be beneficial because, at all times, two-thirds of the board members would have at least one year of experience.⁵

In Milwaukee, according to the report of 1869, the board of education consisted of two members from each ward of the city, appointed by the common council in joint convention.⁶ Members of the board might be removed from their offices by the common council for reasons for which aldermen and councilors were removed.⁷

In 1862 New York had a complicated system of school officers which might have functioned efficiently and effectively, although it is difficult to believe that such would have been the case.⁸ The board of education was composed of forty-four members elected by wards for a term of two years.⁹ In each ward there were, in addition to the two commissioners, eight trustees, two of whom were elected annually for terms of four years.¹⁰ The trustees were held responsible for the schools in their wards and were required to report to the board of education.¹¹ Supplementing

¹Ibid., p. 141.

²Ibid.

³Fortieth Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 32-34. Cleveland: Board of Education, 1876.

⁴Ibid., pp. 19-20, 1884.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 20. Cleveland Board of Education, 1884.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners to His Honor the Mayor and the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, pp. 79-80. Milwaukee: Board of School Commissioners, 1869.

⁷Ibid., p. 80.

⁸Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, pp. 14-16. New York: Board of Education, 1862

⁹Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 15.

¹¹Ibid.

the work of the commissioners and trustees, were two inspectors in each ward elected by the people.¹

In 1867 an attempt was made to abolish the board of education of New York, together with the trustees and inspectors.² It was proposed to substitute a commission of seven persons appointed by the Governor and Senate.³ The bill proposing the change failed to become a law. The reason cited for the change was that the schools under the existing law were inefficient and poorly managed.⁴ In order to check on the authenticity of the accusations made against the system, the legislative committee on education visited and examined the schools.⁵ The committee was satisfied that the charges had been exaggerated and the application for a change in the administration was dismissed.⁶ To check on the examination of the legislative committee, the presidents, secretaries, and several members of the boards of education of Baltimore and Philadelphia inspected the schools of New York. These delegates were entirely convinced that the organization was functioning efficiently.⁷ Apparently there was no thought of a survey by professionally trained individuals. Lay opinion was considered to be sufficiently valid.

The superintendent of schools in the first report made after the consolidation of New York, in 1898, made a number of accusations against the local committee system as it operated in Brooklyn.⁸ He charged that it was not possible to secure good teachers and not possible to promote and transfer teachers as they should be promoted and transferred.⁹ The president of the board of Brooklyn called on the superintendent to produce the evidence to substantiate his charges.¹⁰ The superintendent asked for time to consider and take advice on the request, but later refused to discuss the matter further and it was dropped.¹¹ However, the report containing the charges was accepted and published by the board of education.

¹Ibid., p. 16.

²Ibid., p. 80, 1867.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., pp. 1-2, 1899.

⁹Ibid., p. 1.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 2.

¹¹Ibid.

Philadelphia had a most unusual plan of organization of its board of education.¹ In 1896 the board consisted of thirty-seven members, one from each ward, appointed by the judges of the Court of Common Pleas.² In addition there was a board of twelve school directors for each ward in the city, elected by the people of the respective wards.³ The members of the board of public education were appointed from the membership of the ward boards of school directors.⁴ There were in all 444 members of boards of education in the city. This condition existed thirteen years after the city had decided that it needed a superintendent of schools to supervise instruction. The business of the school district was transacted, for the most part, by the board of public education or central board. The boards of school directors elected the teachers, appointed the janitors, and were responsible for the purely local interests of the schools.⁵ The acts of the boards of school directors were subject to the approval of the central board of public education.⁶

The mayor was evidently the chief school authority in Washington in 1867.⁷ The board of trustees, consisting of twelve members, three from each district, was appointed annually by the mayor. The mayor served as ex officio president of the board and selected the secretary and treasurer.⁸

The manner of choosing and the length of term of the members of the boards of education of Nashville and New Haven form a pleasing contrast to the conditions already discussed. The Nashville board in 1871 had a membership of nine, three of whom were chosen by the city council each year.⁹ If the report of the superintendent for 1871 can be relied upon, the board was free from tendencies toward political intrigues. The board of education was given sole authority to manage the school system.¹⁰

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, pp. 6-7. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1896.

²Ibid., p. 6.

³Ibid., p. 7.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Annual Report of the School District of Washington, pp. 19-21. Washington: Board of Education, 1867.

⁸Ibid., p. 20.

⁹Annual Report of the Board of Education of the Public Schools of Nashville, pp. 9-10. Nashville: Board of Education, 1872.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 10.

The board of education of New Haven also consisted of nine members in 1871.¹ They were chosen for terms of three years, one-third each year, by the annual meeting of the school district. By 1873 the city of New Haven had been made a school district and the board of education was elected by the people, without regard to ward or sub-district lines. Apparently its services were entirely satisfactory.²

Relationship Between Boards of Education and City Councils

Adequate school buildings and sufficient revenue are essential to the successful operation of a system of schools. The responsibility of providing these two essentials was frequently made the duty of the city council, or some branch of the city government other than the board of education. In a few cities the councils were given specific direction of other school activities, as well, but the cases were rare. However, failure to provide adequate and suitable school buildings to house the program planned by those responsible for its organization, was a handicap far-reaching in its extent. Lopping needed funds from the estimates submitted by the boards of education was no less deadly in its effect on the school program. Such conditions confronted many boards of education and superintendents of schools. The problems created by the conditions had to be solved or avoided; and to do either required much patience, tact, and skill. Superintendents who were expected to administer schools in cities where they were unable to secure sufficient buildings and revenue were definitely handicapped. It was not possible either to develop an adequate school system or to establish a satisfactory status for the superintendent. The materials of this section will reveal the practices which were prevalent in a number of city school systems. Throughout the section the point of view held is that the most desirable and effective type of control over school finances is that type which is rested in the board of education. The discussion will reveal what handicaps were imposed on the boards and how those handicaps curtailed the effectiveness of the work of the superintendent of schools.

The Ohio cities solved the problem at a date sufficiently early to prevent the situation from becoming acute. In 1873, a law was passed by the Ohio Legislature giving boards of education

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education of the New Haven City School District, p. 38. New Haven: Board of Education, 1871.

²Ibid., pp. 30-32, 1873.

in towns and cities of the state exclusive authority to regulate their school affairs.¹ Previous to the passage of the Ohio law the city council of Cleveland exercised a considerable measure of control over the buildings and finances of the city school system.² The city council was authorized to provide and support sufficient schools to enable all of the children to receive a common school education.³ The board of education was required to certify to the council the amount of money necessary to be raised for school purposes and the city council might levy a tax for an amount greater or less than the sum requested.⁴ The approval of the city council was necessary in fixing the boundaries of school districts.⁵ The board of education could not spend more than fifty dollars for furniture or repairs for any one school without obtaining the consent of the city council.⁶ When schoolrooms were needed the board of education recommended to the city council that a site be purchased and a building erected.⁷ The law required the city council to act on the request of the board of education "without delay."⁸

The council of Cincinnati previous to the passage of the Ohio Law of 1873, was required to fix the commencement and termination of the school term as well as to establish the time and duration of all vacations. It was also authorized to provide for the annual examination of the schools.⁹ The board of school trustees was required to make a report to the city council once in every three months.¹⁰ The city council was authorized to defray the expenses of purchasing lots and erecting buildings by levying a tax of one mill on the dollar on all property in the city.¹¹

The board of school commissioners of the public schools of Milwaukee was confronted with a building shortage as early as

¹Fortieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Cleveland, pp. 32-34. Cleveland: Board of Education, 1876.

²Ibid., p. 32.

³Ibid., p. 33.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., pp. 33-34.

⁹Abstract of the Laws and Ordinances Relating to the Common Schools of the City of Cincinnati, secs. 32-35, pp. 27-34. Cincinnati: Annual Report of the Trustees and Visitors of Common Schools, 1844.

¹⁰Ibid., sec. 32, p. 28.

¹¹Ibid., p. 29.

1849.¹ The school buildings were inadequate and there were no means provided for supplying funds to replace or improve them. The expenses of the city had been so heavy that the board hesitated to ask the Legislature for authority to levy a tax for building purposes.² In 1859 an act was passed by the Wisconsin Legislature empowering the city council of Milwaukee to levy taxes for the support of the schools, the purchase of lots for school purposes, and the erection of school buildings.³ All schoolhouses and school sites were made the property of the city, no lot could be purchased or leased nor any schoolhouse erected except by authority of the ordinance passed by the common council.⁴ In the report for 1873-1874 the school board committee on school buildings complained of the authority of the city council over the school property.⁵ The school board could only make suggestions to the council and board of public works on the purchase of lots for school buildings, and the purchase of school furniture.⁶ By 1889 this condition had become so acute that the president of the board of education devoted considerable space to its discussion in his annual report.⁷ His argument was that the school buildings were being erected without the advice of anyone who really knew the needs of the schools. The board of public works advertised for plans, and the committee of the common council of schools inspected the plans when submitted, and selected the architect.⁸ When suggestions had been made to turn over the responsibility for the erection of school buildings to the board of education the objection was raised that such procedure would lead to jobs and corruption.⁹ The president had taken the trouble to send inquiries on the practices in connection with the erection of school buildings to twenty-one cities, and his replies indicated that in all except one of the cities the selection of plans

¹Third Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners of the City of Milwaukee, pp. 8-9. Milwaukee: Board of School Commissioners, 1849.

²Ibid., p. 9.

³Ibid., p. 79, 1859.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 46, 1873-74.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners of the City of Milwaukee, pp. 46-54. Milwaukee: Board of School Commissioners, 1889.

⁸Ibid., p. 47.

⁹Ibid., p. 48.

for school buildings was in the hands of the board of education.¹

In the report for 1895 the president of the board of education of Milwaukee expressed regret that the bill granting authority to the board for the selection of school sites and buildings had failed to pass the Legislature.² Finally, in 1905, a law was enacted which gave the board of education the authority to erect school buildings.³ In reviewing the situation as it had existed, the superintendent gave some of the results of the former plan of erecting buildings.⁴ According to his account buildings had been erected where they were not needed, and in a number of cases the buildings had never been completely occupied, while at the same time the buildings in adjoining wards were overcrowded.⁵ In order to rectify this condition, attempts had been made to change ward lines, but the attempts had been met with so much opposition that they had to be abandoned.⁶

The board of education of Philadelphia became manager of its own finances in 1911.⁷ Previous to 1906 the city council had complete jurisdiction over the amount of money appropriated to the schools.⁸ By an act of 1905 the city council was compelled to appropriate to the schools an amount equal to five mills on the total assessment of real property within the school district.⁹

By a law passed in 1925 the school committee of Providence was made fiscally independent.¹⁰ Recommendations for new buildings, or additions to existing buildings, were to be made to the city council.¹¹ If the council approved, the building was erected; if the council disapproved, the question was decided by the electors at the next biennial election.¹² No land could be purchased or school buildings erected without the recommendation or approval of the school committee.¹³ The school committee had the sole

¹Ibid., pp. 50-54.

²Ibid., p. 35, 1895.

³Ibid., pp. 20-23, 1907-1908.

⁴Ibid., pp. 22-23.

⁵Ibid., p. 23.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Philadelphia, pp. 154-55. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1912.

⁸Ibid., p. 155.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Providence, p. 8. Providence: School Committee, 1925.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Ibid., p. 9.

direction of the alteration and repair of school buildings, the cost of which was included in the appropriation for public schools.¹

In the report for 1859 the superintendent of Boston called the attention of the school committee to the fact that he was required by their regulations to consult with the different bodies which had control of the building and altering of schoolhouses.² Despite the superintendent's willingness and even eagerness to obey the regulation, he had not been consulted.³ The superintendent stated also that the school committee had not been consulted on the plans and locations of three school buildings then being erected.⁴ By 1894 the demand for additional schoolhouses in Boston was so acute that the situation was one of great seriousness.⁵ The school committee had presented to the city council an annual list of the buildings needed, but the council had failed to appropriate the necessary funds.⁶ No sites could be purchased or buildings erected until the city council appropriated the requisite funds.⁷ In some cases several years had elapsed between the requests for and the granting of the appropriations needed.⁸

In 1905 the schoolhouse department of the city of Boston was created and was composed of three commissioners appointed by the mayor to have charge of the purchase of sites and the erection and repairs of school buildings.⁹ At the present time the school committee of Boston has power to appropriate directly all money raised for the maintenance and support of the public schools, for the purchase of sites, and for the construction of school buildings.¹⁰ The money appropriated is expended by the schoolhouse department, the body created in 1905.¹¹

The relationship between the board of education of Chicago and the city council seemed to be characterized by indefiniteness. Apparently there was, for a long time at least, a lack of careful delineation of the powers and duties of the two bodies. The

¹Ibid.

²Seventh Quarterly Report of the Superintendent of the Boston Schools, p. 50. Boston: School Committee, 1859.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., pp. 26-31, 1894.

⁶Ibid., p. 29.

⁷Ibid., p. 30.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., pp. 164-65, 1910.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 46, 1929.

¹¹Report of the Superintendent of the Boston Schools, p. 46. Boston: School Committee, 1929.

president of the school board in the report for 1868 stated that the board of education was performing many acts that belonged to the city council.¹ Most of these acts were related to the renting of school buildings, supplying furniture and fixtures, and keeping the schoolhouses in repair.² Again in 1871 the same situation was discussed by the president, who complained that the council was assuming duties that belonged to the board of education.³ No mention was made of specific trespasses on the part of the council.

In 1872 a law passed the Illinois Legislature which attempted to define the relationship between the city council and the board of education.⁴ With the concurrence of the city council the board of education could:

1. Erect or purchase buildings suitable for schoolhouses and keep same in repair.
2. Buy or lease sites for schoolhouses with the necessary grounds.
3. Issue bonds for the purpose of building, furnishing, and repairing schoolhouses, for purchasing sites, and provide for the payment of said bonds, borrow money for school purposes upon the credit of the city.⁵

The board of education was given the sole power to:

1. Furnish the schools with the necessary fixtures, furniture, and apparatus.
2. Maintain, support, and establish schools, and supply the inadequacy of the school fund for the salaries of school teachers from school taxes.
3. Hire rooms or buildings for the use of the schools.
4. Hire rooms or buildings for the use of the board.
5. Employ teachers and fix the amount of their salaries.
6. Prescribe the school books to be used and the studies in the different schools.
7. Lay off and divide the city into school districts and from time to time alter the same and create new ones as circumstances might require.⁶

The law further specified that the council should have no power to exercise authority delegated to the board of

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 27-28.
Chicago: Board of Education, 1868.

²Ibid., p. 28.

³Ibid., pp. 17-18, 1871.

⁴Ibid., pp. 43-45, 1879.

⁵Ibid., p. 43.

⁶Ibid.

education.¹ Conveyances of real estate were to be made to the city in trust for the use of the schools.² The funds of the school district were to be held by the city treasurer subject to the order of the board of education on warrants to be countersigned by the mayor and city clerk.³

In the report of the school system of Chicago for 1885 the suggestion was made that it would be advantageous for the board of education to have the power to purchase land directly from the owners.⁴ According to the report, two years sometimes elapsed between the time of calling for bids and the final authorization of the purchase by the council.⁵ By 1888 the relationship between the council and board of education was again strained and acute.⁶ The definite relations provided for in the law of 1872 had apparently been subverted, and the comptroller, according to the president of the board, was acting under the authority granted to him by the law operative prior to 1872.⁷ The board of education could not buy a broom, a pane of glass, chalk, or a lock and key without the concurrence of the city council.⁸ The council insisted that no new buildings could be erected until plans, cost, and expediency had been submitted to and approved by the council, and as a result of this condition no new buildings had been erected for two years.⁹ Since the money for the erection of the buildings was in the hands of the city treasurer, the president suggested that the delay might be explained by the desire of someone to draw interest on it.¹⁰ The situation, in the opinion of the president, was caused by the refusal of the comptroller to obey the law passed in 1872.¹¹ Conditions in Chicago had not improved in 1890, and in 1896 the report of the superintendent made mention of the fact that the common council had cut \$2,000,000 off the resources of the board of education.¹²

The board of school trustees of Washington was subject to close control by the city council. The report of the schools for

¹Ibid., p. 44.

²Ibid., p. 45.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., pp. 84-85, 1885.

⁵Ibid., p. 85.

⁶Ibid., pp. 40-53, 1888.

⁷Ibid., p. 41.

⁸Ibid., pp. 41-42.

⁹Ibid., p. 42.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 43.

¹¹Ibid., p. 48.

¹²Ibid., pp. 16-17, 1896.

1867 mentioned some unsatisfactory conditions in the relationships between the two bodies.¹ The trustees were required to submit to the city council estimates of the amount of funds needed in order to receive appropriations.² Bills were frequently passed in the council relative to the schools without reference to or recommendations of the school trustees.³ Money was expended for schoolhouses without action of the trustees, and the trustees for that reason were unable to relieve localities in the greatest need of school buildings.⁴ The report for 1870 continued the complaints made in 1867. The city council still made the appropriations, elected the officers of the board, determined the grade and number of schools, and fixed the salaries of teachers.⁵ The trustees were almost without authority to spend money, since they could spend not more than fifty dollars on any one schoolhouse without written authority from the mayor or an act of the councils.⁶ Conditions had grown worse by 1879. The report for that year mentioned the fact that the school district was renting more than one-third of all the schoolrooms occupied.⁷ The rented rooms were very unsatisfactory as to ventilation, light, and convenience of arrangement.⁸ The matter of responsibility for school buildings, according to the report, had never been properly fixed, and the report stated that the schoolhouses of the district were a reproach to the capital of the country.⁹

The responsibility for the administration of the educational program of Washington was divided as late as 1922. The superintendent explained the financial machinery of the school system in the report for that year.¹⁰ The board of trustees divided authority and responsibility over the amount of school appropriations with the district commissioners, the bureau of the budget, the appropriations committee of Congress, and Congress itself.¹¹ After the appropriations were made, the expenditures were subject to review by the auditor of the United States

¹Annual Report of the Public Schools, p. 22. Washington: Board of Education, 1867.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., pp. 8-9, 1870.

⁶Ibid., p. 9.

⁷Ibid., pp. 65-66, 1879.

⁸Ibid., p. 65.

⁹Ibid., p. 66.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 112, 1921-22.

¹¹Ibid.

Treasury.¹ The auditor and comptroller of the district had assumed the authority to question the qualifications and salaries of teachers.² The unsatisfactory conditions, in the opinion of the superintendent, were due to the fact that the methods of conducting the business of the United States Government were not successfully applicable to the conducting of the business of the school system.³

The report of the superintendent of Louisville for 1925-1926 stated that the council had cut \$103,000 off the budget for the school year extending from July, 1925, to July, 1926.⁴

In the report for 1882 the president of the board of education of New York mentioned a cut of \$446,925 on a request for \$3,826,925.⁵ The superintendent in the report for 1912 called attention to the fact that aldermen of the city were responsible for a school building shortage.⁶ By reason of new schedule lines for draughtsmen, it had not been possible to employ a sufficient number of them to get out plans for the school buildings for which funds had been appropriated.⁷

In 1875 the board of education of Rochester voted to close the schools because of an inadequate appropriation by the city council.⁸ After a strenuous protest on the part of citizens and the newspapers, \$85,000 was advanced by a resident of the city and the schools were not closed.⁹

In the report for 1873 the superintendent of Nashville discussed the relations between the board of education and the city council in the matter of school buildings.¹⁰ The city council committee on schools had absolute control over the architectural design, cost of construction and erection of school buildings.¹¹ During 1873 the council had attempted to dictate the site for a

¹Ibid., p. 117.

²Ibid., p. 119.

³Ibid.

⁴Report of the Superintendent of Schools, p. 47. Louisville: Board of Education, 1925-26.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, pp. 7-8. New York: Board of Education, 1882.

⁶Ibid., p. 60, 1912.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Thirty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 10-11. Rochester: Board of Education, 1875.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Annual Report of the Board of Education for the City Schools of Nashville, pp. 19-20. Nashville: Board of Education, 1874.

¹¹Ibid., p. 19.

building and the resulting misunderstanding had delayed the erection of the building for a considerable period of time.¹

The Size of Boards of Education

Mention has already been made of the colossal size to which the board of education of Philadelphia grew. While the situation in Philadelphia was an extreme one, many other boards of education were too large to function expeditiously. The conviction that each ward of the city or school district needed definite and distinct representation on the board of education was chiefly responsible for the large size which the boards attained.

The large boards of education were unwieldy and the delay which resulted from the attempts to conduct business with the cumbersome organizations seriously hampered the educational program of the schools. The large number of members of the boards and the apparent necessity for giving each member some duties made it almost impossible to give to the superintendent the responsibility which should have been given to him.

Boston holds the record for having had the second largest board of education in the United States. Just before the separate board for primary schools was abolished in 1855 the combined school boards of Boston numbered two hundred and seventeen.² From 1789 to 1875 the board was elected by wards, the number from each ward varying from one to six.³ When the method of election by wards was abolished in 1875, the board had grown to one hundred and sixteen.⁴ From 1875 to 1885 it was composed of twenty-four members and the mayor.⁵ From 1885 to 1906 it was composed of twenty-four members elected at large, and since 1906 it has been composed of five members elected at large.⁶

The report of the school committee of Boston for 1876 commented on the reduction of the board from one hundred sixteen to twenty-five members.⁷ Under the large board, according to this report, the real business was transacted by a small nucleus of the

¹Ibid.

²Report of the Boston School Committee, School Document Number 9, pp. 38-39. Boston: School Committee, 1906.

³Ibid., p. 39.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Report of the School Committee, pp. 3-5. Boston: School Committee, 1876.

members. This small group frequently suffered the handicap of having its best measures vetoed by the decision of the majority, some of whom were neither capable nor interested.¹ The smaller board, elected from the city at large, was better able to transact the business and was less likely to have been elected from political motives.²

In 1865 Providence had a school committee numbering forty-five, forty-two of whom were elected by the people by wards. The three remaining members were the mayor, the president of the common council, and the chairman of the standing committee on education of the council.³ As the number of wards increased, the school committee grew larger, until it numbered sixty elective and three ex officio members in 1886.⁴ The size of the committee was gradually reduced to thirty-three through the provisions of a law passed in 1889.⁵ In 1925 it was reduced to seven members, one elected from each of the five districts of the city and two at large.⁶

The board of thirty-six members of Milwaukee in 1889 was too large for efficient functioning.⁷ The board, under its rules, could not take final action on important measures unless there was an attendance of two-thirds of the membership; and the average attendance for sixteen meetings, previous to the time the report of 1889 was written, was only twenty-four.⁸ Requests for purchase of supplies and for repairs to school buildings required at least two months before final action could be taken.⁹ The size of the board was increased to forty-two members in 1896, and this increase, according to the report of the president, added greatly to the complexity of the organization.¹⁰ The larger board was in office only one year when a law passed the Wisconsin Legislature changing the organization.¹¹ The number of members was reduced from forty-six to twenty-three, the duties were more definitely

¹Ibid., p. 4.

²Ibid., p. 5.

³Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Providence, p. 4. Providence: School Committee, 1865.

⁴Ibid., p. 6, 1925-26.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Annual Report of the Public Schools of the City of Milwaukee, pp. 22-25. Milwaukee: Board of Education, 1889.

⁸Ibid., p. 22.

⁹Ibid., p. 23.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 27-29, 1897.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 58-63, 1905.

stated and the superintendency received greater recognition.¹ The new board was appointed (one from each ward) by a commission of four persons selected by the mayor.² In 1905 the board was again reduced in size, twelve members being appointed by the circuit judges from the city at large. This number was increased to fifteen in 1907.³

In 1857 the board of education of New York consisted of forty-four members, two from each ward of the city.⁴ In 1864 the state legislature passed a law which reduced the membership to twenty-one.⁵ The city was divided into seven districts and three members were elected from each district.⁶ The local boards of education were abolished after January 1, 1865.⁷ In 1869 another act was passed which completely changed the school board.⁸ The city was made one school district and twelve members of the board of education were elected at large; this organization continued until 1873, when the law was again changed.⁹ Under the change the size of the board was increased to twenty-one members, appointed at large by the mayor; the local boards were restored and were appointed by the members of the board of education.¹⁰ The reason given for the change was that the previous organization had placed the board in politics.¹¹

The next change in the membership of the board of education was made when the boroughs were united in 1898 to form greater New York. The new board consisted of forty-six members appointed by the mayor -- Manhattan had twenty-two members, the Bronx four, Brooklyn fourteen, Queens four, and Richmond two.¹² The present board of education of the city of New York consists of seven members, appointed by the mayor; two are from Manhattan, two from Brooklyn, and one each from the Bronx, Queens, and Richmond.¹³

¹Ibid., p. 60.

²Ibid., p. 59.

³Ibid., p. 21, 1919.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, p. 17. New York: Board of Education, 1857.

⁵Ibid., p. 19, 1864.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 21.

⁸Ibid., pp. 24-26, 1869.

⁹Ibid., p. 27, 1878.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 27-28.

¹²Ibid., pp. 11-14, 1902.

¹³Department of Education, Directory of the Board of Education of the City of New York, p. 7. New York: Board of Education, 1929.

There are fifty-four district boards, each having a membership of five, which hold regular monthly meetings and are assigned the care of the schools in their districts. A superintendent is assigned to each district and each member of the board of education is assigned the oversight of several districts and district boards.¹

The president of the board for Detroit in the report for 1865 suggested that the size of the board be reduced from twenty to ten members.² As an argument for the change he stated that since the board was an administrative and not a legislative body, its size made administration difficult.³ The board, in the opinion of the president, should consist of from five to eight members appointed by the mayor with the approval of the common council.⁴ The report of the president for 1904 expressed supreme confidence in the plan of organization as it was then operating, on the ground that a smaller board did not follow out the principle of government by the people.⁵ He was convinced that for the people to have representation, the board should be elected by wards.⁶ In the report for the same year the secretary mentioned that already three attempts had been made to have the Legislature pass a law giving the people of the city the right to decide, by vote, whether they wanted a large or a small board.⁷ Finally, in 1912, the Michigan Legislature passed a law giving the people of Detroit the privilege of deciding whether they wanted a large or small board.⁸ As a result of the vote the board was reduced from a ward representative board to a board of seven members representing the city at large.⁹ The new board, according to the report of the superintendent for 1918, represented the community at large without the partisan interests that influenced the larger body.¹⁰

Attempts to change boards of education from large bodies elected by wards to smaller bodies elected without regard to ward lines produced a bitter struggle in the Ohio Legislature in 1904.¹¹

¹Ibid.

²Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 9-11.
Detroit: Board of Education, 1865.

³Ibid., p. 10.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., pp. 13-14, 1904.

⁶Ibid., p. 14.

⁷Ibid., p. 17.

⁸Ibid., p. 133, 1918.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 21-22.
Columbus: Board of Education, 1904.

Because of the struggle the resulting law was a compromise. The boards were made up of some members elected by wards and some elected at large and the existing boards of education were given the privilege of deciding how the members were to be appointed.¹

The board of Columbus decided to elect three members at large and one from each of the twelve wards of the city.² At the same time the other cities of the state of Ohio adopted the small board of education.³ In 1913 Columbus adopted the small board plan. The board elected in that year consisted of seven members chosen from the city at large.⁴

In 1875 the board of education in St. Louis consisted of twenty-six members, two elected from each ward of the city.⁵ By 1879 the board had grown to twenty-eight members elected in the same manner.⁶ In 1897 the Missouri Legislature passed a law changing the size and manner of election of the board to twelve members selected on a bi-partisan ticket from the city at large.⁷ Ten years later, in the report for 1907, the superintendent of St. Louis commented on the organization of the board in the highest terms.⁸ It seemed to be his conviction that the people of St. Louis owed a debt of gratitude to those who had inaugurated the bi-partisan character and non-partisan conduct of the board of education. The board had been, for some years, composed of six republicans and six democrats and was entirely removed from political influence of any kind.⁹

The board of education in Rochester was elected at large for the first time in 1899.¹⁰ The board had been elected by wards from 1841 and at the time of the change numbered twenty members.¹¹ The new board was composed of five members elected for terms of four years, with the terms expiring alternately.¹²

¹Ibid., p. 21.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 22.

⁴Ibid., pp. 31-32, 1914.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education of the St. Louis Schools, p. 178. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1875.

⁶Ibid., p. 252, 1879.

⁷Ibid., pp. 11-13, 1897.

⁸Ibid., pp. 16-17, 1907.

⁹Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁰Fifty-first Annual Report and Documents of Rochester, p. 30. Rochester: Board of Education, 1899.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid.

On January 1, 1911, the board of education of Louisville, consisting of fourteen members elected by wards, was succeeded by a board of five members elected at large on a non-partisan ticket.¹

Number and Duties of Committees of Boards of Education

After taking into consideration the number and wide range of duties of the standing committees into which boards of education were frequently divided, it is difficult to determine just what responsibilities were left to the superintendent of schools. New committees, as a general rule, were created to investigate and take charge of new responsibilities of the school system.

The report of the schools of Chicago for 1867 mentioned the creation of a standing committee on music, which was made responsible for arranging the number of lessons in music to be given in each school, length of time to be given to each lesson, and all other details in connection with the instruction in music.² The report for 1869 contained an account of the efforts of the standing committee on the normal school to secure a teacher for that school. The committee had been given authority to establish the normal school and have charge of the details of its management.³ Mention was made in the report for 1884 of the creation in 1881 of a standing committee on sanitary affairs. It was the duty of this committee to see that existing buildings were in a sanitary condition and that all new buildings were erected in accordance with the best known sanitary provisions.⁴

The report of Providence for 1876 mentioned the appointment of a sub-committee to investigate the problems of ventilation of school buildings.⁵ This problem, according to the report, was of so much importance that the school committee was considering the appointment of a standing committee on the sanitary conditions of the schools.⁶

Columbus, in 1888, established and defined the duties of a standing committee on manual training, which was required to perform all of the duties in connection with the establishment of

¹Third Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 5. Louisville: Board of Education, 1914.

²Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 82. Chicago: Board of Education, 1867.

³Ibid., pp. 32-33, 1869.

⁴Ibid., p. 123, 1884.

⁵Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Providence, p. 5. Providence: School Committee, 1876.

⁶Ibid.

manual training in the schools.¹

Baltimore, in 1897, in compliance with the recommendation of a committee established for the purpose of inquiring into the introduction of physical training into the schools decided to introduce the work gradually.²

Louisville, on December 8, 1890, placed a manual training committee among the standing committees of the board of education; and after two years of effort this committee was successful in having a manual training high school established.³

It was not until the study of German was placed under a standing committee of the board of education of Milwaukee in 1872 that the study was successfully introduced into the schools.⁴ Previous to 1872 several attempts had been made to introduce the study of German but all of them had been unsuccessful.⁵ In the report for 1887 the superintendent recommended that the board create a standing committee on physical education and school hygiene.⁶ He was aware that the creation of the committee would likely precipitate a conflict between the board of education and the city council, but he felt that the need of the committee outweighed the possible consequences of the conflict.⁷ In the report for 1895 the president of the board congratulated that body on its creation of a standing committee on manual training.⁸ Manual training had been introduced into the schools in 1891, but the work had not received proper care and attention.⁹ The president felt that the standing committee would soon be able to ameliorate the unfavorable conditions which were hindering the proper development of the subject.

The committee roster of Baltimore for 1890 listed twenty-six standing committees.¹⁰ There were committees on: (1) Baltimore City College, (2) female high schools, (3) grammar schools,

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 150-51.
Columbus: Board of Education, 1888.

²Sixty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of the Public Schools to the Mayor and Common Council of the City of Baltimore, p. xii. Baltimore: Board of Commissioners, 1897.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 127. Louisville: Board of Education, 1896.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 79. Milwaukee: Board of Education, 1877.

⁵Ibid., pp. 78-79.

⁶Ibid., pp. 79-80, 1887.

⁷Ibid., p. 80.

⁸Ibid., p. 30, 1895.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Annual Report of the Baltimore School District, pp. 4-5.
Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1890.

(4) primary schools, (5) English-German schools, (6) manual training schools, (7) colored schools, (8) normal school, (9) textbooks, (10) furniture, (11) music, (12) discipline, (13) accounts, (14) expenditures, (15) examinations, (16) bi-weekly reports, (17) conferences, (18) buildings, (19) printing, (20) health, (21) drawing, (22) interstate estates, (23) heating apparatus and fuel, (24) rules, (25) public school library, (26) non-resident pupils. An analysis of the membership of the various committees shows that the superintendent was a member of four.¹ The fact that the mayor was a member of the committee on normal training, while the superintendent was not a member of that committee, is rather startling.² The superintendent was not a member of any of the committees dealing with finance, furniture, music, drawing, and health. The activities involved were directed by committees of which the superintendent was not a member.³

Chicago in 1861 had eleven committees of the board of education. The list of committees follows:

1. A Committee on School Buildings and Grounds, consisting of three members.
2. A Committee on Textbooks and Course of Instruction, consisting of three members.
3. A Committee on Rules and Regulations, consisting of three members.
4. A Committee on Apparatus and Furniture, consisting of three members.
5. A Committee on Examination of Teachers, consisting of three members and the Superintendent.
6. A Committee on the Appointment of Teachers, consisting of the President of the Board, the Chairman of the Committee on the Examination of Teachers, and one other member.
7. A Committee on Janitors and Supplies, consisting of the Chairman of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds, the Chairman of the Auditing Committee, and one other member.
8. A Committee on Medals and Rewards, consisting of three members.
9. An Auditing Committee, consisting of three members.
10. A Committee on the High School, consisting of three members.
11. A Committee of one for each of the District Schools.

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 5.

³Ibid., pp. 4-5.

The superintendent of the schools of Chicago was a member of but one committee, namely, that on examination of teachers.¹ By 1872 the number of committees of the board had been increased to twenty, but the superintendent of schools had not been assigned to any committee except the one on which he held membership in 1861.² The committees added to the 1861 list were those on (1) salaries, (2) normal school, (3) school fund property, (4) judiciary, (5) publication, (6) evening schools, (7) German, (8) music, (9) drawing.³ By 1878 the number of committees had been reduced to nineteen. The superintendent retained his membership on the committee on examination of teachers.⁴ The committees were divided into two groups called business committees and school committees, with a miscellaneous group to classify those committees which did not belong specifically to either of the two groups.⁵

In the report for 1880 the superintendent made the statement that the board of education was not only too large but also that it had a dozen more committees than were necessary. He was convinced that no business concern would try to conduct its affairs in the same manner as did the board of education.⁶ The board, in the opinion of the superintendent, was an administrative and not a legislative body, and as such its complex organization prevented the board from functioning as it should.

Evidently the advice of the superintendent fell on deaf ears for by 1884 the number of committees of the board of education of Chicago had again been increased to twenty. The superintendent was, for the first time, a member of two committees, namely, teachers, and school sites and district boundaries.⁷ The listing of committees for 1889 gave seventeen, the committee on teachers on which the superintendent had held membership, was not listed and the number of members on the committees had been increased to five and seven.⁸ By 1912 the number of committees had

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 107-10.
Chicago: Board of Education, 1861.

²Ibid., p. 224, 1872.

³Ibid.

⁴Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, pp. 3-6. Chicago: Board of Education, 1878.

⁵Ibid., p. 5.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 38-39.
Chicago: Board of Education, 1880.

⁷Rules and Regulations of Boards of Education, pp. 7-8.
Chicago: Board of Education, 1884.

⁸Ibid., p. 2, 1889.

been reduced to thirteen, and in 1922 there were only six committees of the board of education. These committees were:

1. The Committee on School Administration, consisting of five members.
2. Committee on Finance, consisting of five members.
3. Committee on Buildings and Grounds, consisting of five members.
4. Committee on Rules, consisting of five members.
5. Committee on Health and Sanitation, consisting of five members.
6. Committee on Condemnation Settlements, consisting of three members of the Board, to wit: the President and the Chairmen of the Committees on Finance and on Buildings and Grounds, with the Superintendent of Schools, Business Manager and the Attorney acting in an advisory capacity thereon.

Due perhaps to the fact that New York had a system of local boards of education, that city had fewer committees than did Baltimore or Chicago. The report of the schools of New York for 1872 listed nine committees, which had held a total of 296 meetings during the year.¹ In 1905 the superintendent recommended that the local boards be given complete control over the cases arising out of the enforcement of the compulsory school law. He felt that the manner in which the local boards were constituted enabled them to handle the compulsory school law cases most satisfactorily.²

The board of education of New York for 1929 was divided into sixteen standing committees. The list of committees follows: (1) finance and budget, (2) buildings and sites, (3) day schools, (4) evening schools, (5) departmental organization, (6) special schools, (7) law, (8) continuation schools and speech improvement, (9) physical training, (10) supplies, (11) care of buildings, (12) bureau of attendance, (13) lectures, (14) local school boards, (15) nominations, (16) retirement.³ The practice shown by New York in increasing the number of committees into which the board was divided is not borne out by the practices of other cities.

Dallas listed twelve committees in the report for 1894,⁴ and by 1915 this number had been reduced to six.⁵

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 17-18. New York: Board of Education, 1872.

²Ibid., pp. 165-68, 1905.

³Department of Education Directory of the Board of Education of New York, pp. 9-11. New York: Board of Education, 1929.

⁴Tenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Dallas Public Schools, pp. 87-91. Dallas: Board of Directors, 1894.

⁵Ibid., pp. 139-40, 1915.

St. Louis, in 1861, listed eleven standing committees, with the superintendent of schools a member of the committees on teachers, high school, and evening schools.¹ By 1874 the number of committees had been increased to twelve with some changes in the assignments to duties.² The committees on high and evening schools listed in 1861 had been dropped, committees on publication and supplies, rules and regulations, and janitors had been added.³ The superintendent was a member of the committee on teachers and on course of study.⁴ The superintendent in the report for 1879 commented on the committee organization of the board.⁵ The standing committees were composed of one member from each district -- a district consisting of two wards. The committees had charge of the business of recommending teachers, regulating the course of study, selecting plans for school buildings and supervising their erection, leasing the real estate, etc.⁶ The plan was thought by the superintendent to be advantageous in protecting local interests from local influence. The board had four standing committees in 1903, namely, finance, instruction, buildings, auditing, and supplies.⁷ This same assignment of committees was in operation in 1926.⁸

The board of education of Columbus was divided into eleven committees in 1872, and the superintendent was not listed in the membership of any of the committees.⁹ By 1883 the number of committees had been increased to fourteen,¹⁰ and in 1887 the board was divided into fifteen committees, none of which included the superintendent in its membership.¹¹ In the report for 1888 the president of the board expressed the conviction that the board should manage the schools.¹² He did, however, admit that the board was compelled to rely on the superintendent for information on

¹Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Schools, pp. xxvi-xxix. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1861.

²Ibid., p. 25, 1874.

³Ibid., pp. 26-33.

⁴Ibid., pp. 26-28.

⁵Ibid., p. 252; 1879.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., pp. 9-10, 1903.

⁸Ibid., p. 15, 1926.

⁹Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 138-41.

Columbus: Board of Education, 1872.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 52-56, 1883.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 63-67, 1887.

¹²Ibid., pp. 9-10, 1888.

the schools and on the teachers.

The board of education of Columbus in 1891 was divided into sixteen committees.¹ The superintendent was given membership on the committees on normal school, teachers, and examinations.² In the report of the schools for 1922 two standing committees were listed, one in charge of finance and the other of buildings.³ The regulations specified that the duties of these committees were advisory and not executive.⁴

The committees of the board of education of Cincinnati were reduced from twenty-four in 1872 to four by 1908, with the superintendent of schools a member of the committees on examinations and on normal schools and teachers' institute.⁵ The four committees into which the board was divided in 1908 were those on buildings, repairs and sites, finances, and supplies.⁶

Atlanta reduced its standing committees from ten in 1872 to two in 1912. The superintendent was not mentioned in connection with any of the committees for 1872.⁷ The two committees listed in 1912 were those on schools and teachers, of which the mayor was an ex officio member, and a committee on finance, buildings, and school property. The chairman of the city council committee on schools was an ex officio member of the second committee.⁸

Not all boards of education found it necessary to create a large number of standing committees. Denver, in 1875, managed its school affairs with five standing committees, (1) teachers and textbooks, (2) buildings and grounds, (3) finance, (4) high schools and German, (5) supplies.⁹

The board of education of Minneapolis was divided into six committees in 1889.¹⁰ In 1910 this number was reduced to three.¹¹

¹Ibid., pp. 127-30, 1891.

²Ibid., pp. 128-30.

³Rules of Boards of Education, pp. 7-10. Columbus: Board of Education, 1922.

⁴Ibid., p. 7.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education for the Cincinnati Schools, pp. 234-39. Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1872.

⁶Ibid., p. 5, 1908.

⁷Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Atlanta, pp. 40-43. Atlanta: Board of Education, 1872.

⁸Ibid., pp. 74-75, 1912.

⁹Annual Report of the Board of Education of District One, with Rules and Course of Study, pp. 37-38. Denver: Board of Education, 1875.

¹⁰Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 149-50. Minneapolis: Board of Education, 1890.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 7-8, 1911.

The president of the board was well satisfied with the change. Under the previous system, when matters were referred to committees, meetings were delayed for several months and the business to be transacted was lost sight of.¹

New Haven, in 1871, had three standing committees responsible for schools, finances, and school buildings.² The same assignment of committees was operative in 1883.³

Nature of the Reports of Standing Committees

The reports of the standing committees were, as a rule, very general in content. This makes their supposed necessity more difficult to account for. One of the most frequently specified reasons given for the employment of a superintendent of schools was that of the necessity for his services in the supervision of instruction. After his appointment it would seem unnecessary to entrust problems of supervision to lay committees. That such was not the case is revealed in the following sampling of committee reports.

By a resolution of the school committee, passed February 15, 1861, the committee on qualifications in Providence was directed to investigate and report back on the causes of the difference in rank of schools of the same grade in the city.⁴ The committee accepted the assignment, made its investigation, and submitted a report. The causes according to the report were to be found in one or all of three possible conditions: (1) defects in external circumstances, (2) internal management, and (3) general supervision.⁵ The first defect could not be eradicated because of the difference in the types of pupils living in the several sections of the city.⁶ The third was doubtful since the superintendent was exercising general supervision over all of the schools. The committee felt, however, that better schools existed where the district committees visited the schools most frequently.⁷ The second cause, that of internal management, was thought to be the one most likely to contribute to the general unsatisfactory condition which

¹Ibid., p. 8.

²Annual Report of the Board of Education of the New Haven School District, p. xli. New Haven: Board of Education, 1871.

³Ibid., pp. 110-11, 1883.

⁴Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Providence, pp. 23-26. Providence: School Committee, 1862.

⁵Ibid., pp. 24-25.

⁶Ibid., p. 24.

⁷Ibid., p. 25.

they were investigating, since teachers in the poor schools were dispirited and disinterested.¹ As a result of the report the committee was authorized to use its discretion in reemploying the unsatisfactory teachers.² This report was made in 1861; Providence elected its first superintendent of schools in 1839.

The report of the schools of Louisville for 1854 contained a detailed statement of the visiting committee which was remarkable for its generalities and for its lack of definite findings and recommendations. The conclusion of the committee was that a bright and beautiful day was dawning upon the cause of education in Louisville, but the dawning was somewhat obscured by the lack of adequate and sufficient school buildings.³

The question of the employment of local persons as teachers in the schools was an ever-present problem for the committees on teachers to handle. The committee on teachers for Detroit in a report issued in 1871 attempted to make its position clear on the much discussed question.⁴ Its plan was to recommend no one for a position who had not passed a rigid examination or who had not presented evidence to show that he or she had had some successful teaching experience.⁵

Much the same situation was discussed in the report of the committee on teachers for Columbus issued in 1882.⁶ The recommendation of this committee was that men and women from abroad be invited to take teaching positions in the schools and that non-residents be excluded from teaching positions only when there was better trained and more capable talent among those candidates who were residents of Columbus.⁷ It would seem to be no exaggeration to assume that a superintendent of schools who had been given the authority of selecting a teaching staff could easily have surmounted the difficulties presented in the conditions described for both Detroit and Columbus.

The report of the committee on textbooks in Milwaukee for 1873, recommended that the board revise the course of study as

¹Ibid., pp. 24-25.

²Ibid., p. 26.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Louisville, pp. 16-25. Louisville: Board of Education, 1854.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 95-98. Detroit: Board of Education, 1871.

⁵Ibid., pp. 97-98.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 52-53. Columbus: Board of Education, 1882.

⁷Ibid., p. 53.

soon as possible.¹ The committee was of the opinion that the teachers were using too many textbooks in the lower grades, when the only book needed in those grades was a reader.²

The committee on organization for Rochester in the report for 1884 described the method which had been followed in revising the course of study.³ The committee had advised with the superintendent and several of the principals before the changes were made; the superintendent, on the recommendation of the committee, visited the schools of Quincy and Boston, Massachusetts.⁴ The revision of the course attempted to embody the best features of the then famous Quincy system.⁵

Many more examples of the performance of professional tasks by lay members of boards of education, after the district had employed a superintendent of schools, might be given. It is difficult even to hazard a guess on the cause for the existence of such conditions. Perhaps the most plausible answer is that of tradition -- boards of education had always been responsible for those matters and therefore should continue to be responsible. There is, of course, the possibility that the superintendents did not display a type of leadership which warranted the boards of education in placing confidence in their ability to solve the problems arising. On the other hand the opportunities for the display of leadership were very definitely limited by the restrictions imposed by the activities and responsibilities for which the board committees were given authority.

Designating the Superintendents as the Executive
Officers of the Board of Education

Of the twenty-six cities whose regulations governing the duties of the first superintendent of schools were analyzed in Chapter III, Atlanta, Nashville, and San Francisco were the only ones which designated that official as the executive officer of the board of education. The following table shows the time at which the superintendent was named the executive officer in twenty leading cities.

¹Milwaukee Public Schools. Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners of the City of Milwaukee, pp. 27-28. Milwaukee: Board of School Commissioners, 1874.

²Ibid., p. 38.

³Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 41-42. Rochester: Board of Education, 1884.

⁴Ibid., p. 42.

⁵Ibid.

TABLE XVI

DESIGNATIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AS THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
OF BOARDS OF EDUCATION

City	Date of Designation	Years After Appointment
San Francisco.....	1852	0
Nashville.....	1854	0
Cleveland.....	1868	15
Atlanta.....	1871	0
Omaha.....	1883	11
Cincinnati.....	1887	27
Los Angeles.....	1887	35
Columbus.....	1889	42
Houston.....	1891	18
Dallas.....	1894	6
Chicago.....	1895	41
New Haven.....	1896	37
St. Louis.....	1897	38
Baltimore.....	1898	49
Boston.....	1898	47
Rochester.....	1900	57
New York.....	1903	52
Detroit.....	1910	55
Denver.....	1919	48
Philadelphia.....	1933	50

The radical administrative reorganization of the school system of Cleveland in 1892 gave the superintendent of schools unusual powers. Under the Cleveland, or Federal, Plan the board of education was reduced to seven members selected at large.¹ The powers of the board were restricted to legislation.² A school director as executive of the business department was elected by the people; he appointed the superintendent of schools with the approval of the board of education, which body was also called the school council.³

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 26-27.
Cleveland: Board of Education, 1903.

²Ibid., p. 26.

³Ibid.

The superintendent of schools was in sole charge of the educational department of the schools.¹ The terms of the school council and school director were two years, that of the superintendent during good behavior.² The chief advantage claimed for the plan from the educational point of view was that of relieving teachers of the uncertainty of their tenure, and of removing improper influence in the selection of teachers.³ The extent to which political influence had dominated the schools was brought out in the report of the school director for 1903. He stated that both he and the superintendent had been conjoled, promised, and threatened in the matter of securing positions for teachers.⁴ The Cleveland, or Federal, Plan was abolished by the Ohio School Code of 1904, which placed all legislative, executive, and administrative authority in the hands of the board of education.⁵

The reorganization in St. Louis which made the superintendent an executive officer of the board of education took place in 1897. The members of the board of education, seven in number, were elected at large.⁶ The immediate responsibility for the administration of the school system rested in the salaried officers of the school district and no committee of the board of education had any executive authority.⁷ The board of education was given authority over the expenditure of money, the determination of the number of employees and their salaries, and questions of general policy.⁸ The board was expected to secure the best available experts to carry on the work and to exercise supervision over the work of the experts.⁹ It is evident that the enactment of the law caused some disturbance in St. Louis. The editor of one of the papers in writing of the change dubbed the superintendent a "pedagogic Pope, absolutely infallible, unamenable to anyone or anything."¹⁰ Later the same paper warned the people that the law was designed to give opportunity for the militarization of the schools.¹¹ Some of these views were likely occasioned by the

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., pp. 56-57, 1903.

⁵Ibid., p. 9, 1905.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of Education of the St. Louis Schools, pp. 11-13. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1897.

⁷Ibid., p. 12.

⁸Ibid., p. 13.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 251-55, 1913.

¹¹Ibid., p. 254.

fact that Superintendent Soldan was of German birth.

The president of the school committee of Boston in the report for 1874 commented on the fact that the superintendent had no power. The superintendent could not vote and could not directly initiate any change in the school system.¹ All that he accomplished had to be done through the influence of his reports on the members of the school committee.²

The regulations making the superintendent the executive officer of the school committee of Boston were adopted in June, 1898.³ The superintendent was, for the first time, given some executive authority, and the legislative and executive functions of the administration of the school system were completely separated.⁴ The superintendent was made the executive officer in all matters relating to instruction.⁵

The superintendent of schools of Baltimore was made executive officer of the board of education by the charter of 1898.⁶ The rules gave the superintendent the authority to examine teachers and to advise the board with respect to courses of study and textbooks.⁷ He was also, with the aid of a supervisor, authorized to find out the condition of every school building and report on the need of improvements and repairs.⁸

The school report of Cincinnati for 1851 discussed the limitations which had been placed on the position of superintendent.⁹ The board of education, the report stated, could never entirely depute its authority to make changes in the schools to any intermediate agent, since the public had invested it with the exclusive management of the schools.¹⁰ Despite this sentiment expressed in 1851, the regulations of 1887 made the superintendent the executive officer of the board of education in all matters

¹Report of the School Committee, p. 57. Boston: School Committee, 1874.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 77-80, 1899.

⁴Ibid., p. 78.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Eighty-third Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners, pp. 7-8. Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1912.

⁷Ibid., p. 8.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Annual Report of the Trustees and Visitors of Common Schools, pp. 9-10. Cincinnati: Committee of Trustees and Visitors, 1851.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 10.

pertaining to the internal management of the schools.¹ He was made responsible for the instruction, government, discipline, classification and promotion of pupils, the nomination of teachers, and other supervisory duties.²

The superintendent of Columbus was designated the executive officer of the board in the president's report for 1889.³ The president wrote at considerable length on the relationship that should exist between the board of education and the superintendent of schools.⁴ It is difficult to determine, from the report of the president, whether he was attempting to promote correct relationship or to advise the superintendent regarding the limitations of the new official status.⁵

The school organization of Rochester was radically changed in 1900.⁶ By legislative enactment the board was reduced three-fourths in size, the length of term was doubled, the standing committees were abolished, and the functions of the board and superintendent were more specifically defined.⁷ The board was made a legislative body and the superintendent was designated as its executive officer.⁸ The president of the board, in commenting on the change, made mention of a lecture delivered by Hanus of Harvard before a meeting of the Department of Superintendence, which the president had attended.⁹ Hanus enunciated eight conditions on which the successful management of a school system depended:

1. A clear conception, on the part of all concerned with its work, of the purposes for which the school system exists.
2. A clear conception of the difference between the functions of the Board of Education and those of its staff, and actual differentiation between them in practice.
3. Complete accountability of the Board to the people for the work done and the money expended under its direction.

¹Ibid., p. 215, 1890.

²Ibid.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 31-33.

Columbus: Board of Education, 1889.

⁴Ibid., p. 32.

⁵Ibid., p. 33.

⁶Report of the Board of Education of the City of Rochester for 1911-1913, pp. 15-16. Rochester: Board of Education, 1913.

⁷Ibid., p. 16.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., p. 18.

4. A general manager and executive for the whole enterprise appointed by the Board, whose authority is commensurate with his responsibility -- the City Superintendent of Schools.
5. A competent staff of employees for the educational activities and for the business affairs of the school system directly responsible to the general manager.
6. Complete accountability of the general manager and through him of the staff to the Board of Education for the proper performance of the duties with which they are charged.
7. Habitual and well organized self-examination within the school system, including adequate objective appraisal, by the staff, of the results achieved, and well-conducted experiments to confirm or refute educational opinion within and without the school system.
8. Cooperation under leadership, throughout the school system itself, and of the school system and the community.¹

The president felt that the city of Rochester was on a fair way toward at least approximating the principles laid down as desirable by Hanus.²

The regulations of San Francisco governing the administration of the schools, adopted in 1852, made the superintendent of schools the executive officer of the board of education. If the views of the superintendent as expressed in the report of 1890 are correct, the regulation was a dead letter.³ The superintendent made the statement that he was merely a figurehead, that he was seldom if ever consulted, and that his opinions were ignored when they were given.⁴ The only remedy for the existing conditions, in the opinion of the superintendent, was a new charter changing the administrative organization of the schools.⁵ He felt that the schools were holding to their position not because of, but in spite of the laws under which they were organized. He also felt that the devotion of the teachers was an important factor in the successful operation of the schools.⁶

¹Ibid., pp. 19-20.

²Ibid., p. 20.

³Annual Report of the Superintendent of Common Schools in the City and County of San Francisco, pp. 12-16. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1890.

⁴Ibid., p. 14.

⁵Ibid., p. 15.

⁶Ibid., p. 16.

There seems to be some doubt as to the exact time at which the superintendent was made the executive officer of the board of education in several cities.

The president of the board of education of Chicago in the report for 1896 commended the splendid management of the educational department of the schools.¹ The commendation was worded in a way which gave the impression that the superintendent was the executive officer of the board.² In 1901 mention was made of the election of a new superintendent following the increased power given the superintendent and the fact that the results had been satisfactory.³ The report of the president for 1903 mentioned the failure of passage of a bill designed to give permanence to the rules then in force in the school system.⁴ Finally, the report of the president for 1918 quoted a paragraph from a law passed in 1917, which designated the superintendent as the executive officer of the board of education.⁵

The superintendent of the schools of Philadelphia in the report for 1890 stated that, for a long time, Philadelphia had been the only large city not having an executive officer for its schools.⁶ The first regulations governing the duties of the superintendent of schools did not designate him the executive officer of the board of education.⁷ In the report for 1890 the superintendent referred to the restrictions placed on the administrative machinery of the schools.⁸ He further stated that he had abstained from any interference with the administrative organization of the school system.⁹ The regulations governing the duties of the office enacted in 1928 did not specify that the superintendent was the executive officer of the board.¹⁰ The rules adopted in 1928 provided that the superintendent should, subject to the by-laws and rules of the board, have supervision of all

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 32-34.

Chicago: Board of Education, 1896.

²Ibid., p. 34.

³Ibid., p. 12, 1901.

⁴Ibid., p. 20, 1903.

⁵Ibid., pp. 7-8, 1918.

⁶Seventy-second Annual Report of the Board of Public Education, First School District of Pennsylvania Comprising the City of Philadelphia, pp. 8-9. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1890.

⁷Ibid., pp. 286-91, 1883.

⁸Ibid., pp. 11-12, 1890.

⁹Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁰By-laws and Rules of the Board of Education, School District of Philadelphia, pp. 4-6. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1928.

matters pertaining to instruction.¹

The president of the board of education of Milwaukee, in the report for 1917, wrote in considerable detail on the proper division of duties and authority between the superintendent of schools and the board of education.² The president was convinced that the regulations were not clear on the division of duties and responsibilities.³ He was of the opinion that in matters of policy, where the questions were legislative and where the action might outlive the superintendent, the latter should assume a tolerant rather than an arbitrary attitude.⁴ The president was not in favor of the single-headed system and felt that the system found its most ardent advocates among school administrators.⁵ He also stated that the directors of Milwaukee, as well as those in other cities, were suffering under the repression necessary to restrain themselves from going over the head of the superintendent and dealing directly with matters of a purely educational nature.⁶ He realized that these matters were such that members of boards of education had little knowledge and experience which would enable them to act wisely and judiciously.⁷

Duties of the Superintendent in the Selection of Teachers

The selection of teachers was one of the most prolific sources of political influence connected with the management of school systems. As long as members of boards of education were selected by wards the political evils were difficult to eradicate. The residents and voters of the wards expected their representatives on the boards of education to see that candidates for teaching positions from their wards were successful in securing positions. This practice was dealt a hard blow when the ward system of election to positions on the boards of education was abolished.

The system of selecting teachers found in San Francisco was particularly reprehensible. As early as 1867 the president of the board of education suggested that some one person, possibly

¹Ibid., p. 6.

²Milwaukee Public Schools. Annual Report of the Board of School Directors of the City of Milwaukee, pp. 7-11. Milwaukee: Board of Education, 1917.

³Ibid., p. 8.

⁴Ibid., p. 9.

⁵Ibid., p. 11.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

the superintendent of schools, should fill all vacancies in the teaching staff.¹ In 1892 the superintendent of schools, referring to the method of appointing teachers,² declared that the only requisite for a teaching position was the ability to pass an examination conducted by a board of examiners, composed of teachers in the schools, appointed to their positions by the board of education.³ The system of examinations had developed into a vicious circle, according to the superintendent. The board of examiners was afraid not to pass persons taking the examinations lest they should offend the members of the board of education and thereby lose their teaching positions.⁴ There had grown up a series of coaching centers where, in six months, sponsors of the centers prepared prospective teachers to pass the examinations.⁵ At the same time that this condition existed there were three normal schools in the state and one in the city of San Francisco.⁶ In the report for 1900 the president of the board listed, among the important changes necessary for the improvement of the schools, the appointment of teachers on merit and not for personal or political reasons.⁷ The report of the president of the board of education for 1901 recommended that each member of the board should report all improper solicitations of applicants for teaching positions.⁸ He further recommended that no person making an improper approach should ever be given a teaching position in the schools of San Francisco.⁹

The report of the superintendent of San Francisco for 1907-1908 explained a new method for the appointment of teachers.¹⁰ No one was employed as a teacher who did not possess high personal character, liberal education, and sound health and vigor.¹¹ The board of education conducted an annual examination for appointments to the substitute teacher list, and all appointments to the

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, pp. 105-6. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1867.

²Ibid., pp. 180-82, 1892.

³Ibid., p. 181.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., pp. 181-82.

⁶Ibid., p. 182.

⁷Ibid., pp. 19-20, 1900.

⁸Ibid., pp. 11-12, 1901.

⁹Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁰Report of the Superintendent of Schools and Board of Education, pp. 52-55. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1908.

¹¹Ibid., p. 52.

regular teaching staff were made from the substitute list.¹ If any applicant was found guilty of importuning any member of the board of education, the applicant was immediately dropped from the list.²

At about the same time that San Francisco was changing its method of employing teachers, Los Angeles was instituting a reform along the same lines.³ The plan in Los Angeles according to the report of the superintendent of schools in 1906-1907, was based on a competitive examination, which consisted of two parts: one written, the other oral.⁴ The written examination consisted of twelve questions on the theory and practice of education; the oral examination consisted of such questions on the experience in teaching and study of the candidates as the teachers' committee of the board of education cared to ask.⁵ The results of the examinations were tabulated and the candidates appointed in the order of their standing.⁶ Any attempt, on the part of a candidate, to use personal, social, or political "pull" disqualified him.⁷

As a general practice the reduction in size of boards of education and the consequent reduction in the number of standing committees; and the naming of the superintendent as the executive officer of the board of education and the investment of the authority in him to appoint or nominate teachers came at about the same time.

The Federal Plan adopted by Cleveland in 1892 gave the superintendent the duty of appointing the members of the teaching staff and the removal of teachers whose work was not satisfactory.⁸ From 1892 to 1894 the superintendent removed between seventy-five and one hundred teachers whom he considered unsatisfactory.⁹ In commenting on the removals in the report for 1894 the superintendent remarked that no matter how incompetent the teacher who was removed, there was always an attempt made by friends to have her reinstated. On several occasions the newspapers of the city made

¹Ibid., p. 53.

²Ibid., p. 54.

³Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, pp. 32-35.
Los Angeles: Board of Education, 1907.

⁴Ibid., p. 34.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 35.

⁸Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 35-37.
Cleveland: Board of Education, 1894.

⁹Ibid., p. 36.

open attacks on the superintendent because of the removal of teachers.¹

The reorganization in St. Louis made in 1897 placed the control of the schools in the hands of the executive officers of the board and gave the superintendent the responsibility of selecting teachers.² One of the first duties of the superintendent, under the new law, was to eliminate a group of inefficient teachers.³ Under the committee system, which had operated previously, there had always been some member of the committee willing to champion the cause of inefficient teachers, and as a result they had succeeded in remaining on the staff.⁴ The rules prevented the superintendent from discharging teachers until he had reported to the board and received its approval for the action.⁵

The right of the superintendent of Boston to appoint teachers went through several modifications.⁶ In 1897 the supervisors were given the duty of recommending candidates for teaching positions to the committee in charge.⁷ The next year, 1898, the responsibility for appointing principals, supervisors, and teachers was placed in the hands of the superintendent, subject to the approval of the board.⁸ In 1899 the rule was again modified and the superintendent was required to submit his recommendations to a committee before submitting them to the board.⁹ Three years later, in 1902, the control was restored to the 1898 status.¹⁰ In 1904 the procedure reverted to the 1899 status.¹¹ In 1906 the appointment of teachers in Boston was placed on a civil service basis, and the superintendent was given the authority to appoint, reappoint, and remove all directors, principals, and other teachers.¹²

¹Ibid., pp. 36-37.

²Forty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the St. Louis Public Schools, pp. 140-42. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1898.

³Ibid., p. 141.

⁴Ibid., p. 142.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, pp. 13-14. Boston: Board of Education, 1904.

⁷Ibid., p. 13.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid., p. 14.

¹²Ibid., p. 13, 1906.

The charter for Baltimore enacted in 1898, which made the superintendent of schools the executive officer of the board and which reduced the board of education to nine members, gave the superintendent the authority to nominate teachers from the eligible lists.¹ The nominations were subject to confirmation by the board of school commissioners.² No teacher could be removed except after a trial and on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools.³

In Cincinnati the superintendent began to appoint teachers, with the approval of the board, in 1895.⁴ The first appointment was for one year, the second for two years, and the third was continuous except for removal by death, resignation, or for cause as provided by the statutes.⁵

The Ohio School Law of 1904 gave the superintendent of Columbus the responsibility of appointing teachers, subject to the approval and confirmation of the board.⁶

The superintendent of the schools of Detroit was made responsible for the appointment of all administrative officers as well as teachers in 1917.⁷ The duty was conferred as a result of the reorganization of the administration of the school system effected by a reduction in the size of the board of education to seven members.⁸

In 1903 the responsibility for nominating teachers was taken from the members of sub-committees of the school committee of Providence and given to the superintendent of schools.⁹ The change was characterized as one of the most noteworthy that had occurred in the duties and functions of the members of the school committee in years.¹⁰ The teachers had been nominated by members

¹Eighty-third Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners, pp. 8-9. Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1912.

²Ibid., p. 8.

³Ibid.

⁴Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the Public Schools, pp. xv-xvi. Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1896.

⁵Ibid., p. xvi.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 126. Columbus: Board of Education, 1905.

⁷Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 133. Detroit: Board of Education, 1918.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Report of the School Committee, p. 6. Providence: School Committee, 1903.

¹⁰Ibid.

of the school committee ever since the schools had been established.¹

A New York law passed in 1900 gave the superintendent of Rochester the privilege of taking the initiative in the appointment of supervisors, principals, and teachers and in the transfer of teachers.² The same law reduced the size of the board to five members and made the superintendent of schools its executive officer.³

Milwaukee apparently had some difficulty in placing the appointment of teachers in the hands of the superintendent. The president of the board of education, in the report for 1898, referred to the fact that the responsibility for recommending teachers rested with the superintendent of schools.⁴ The superintendent's recommendations were made after consultation with the principals and were made to a committee which reported to the board of education.⁵ The committee to which the report was made was composed of the superintendent, the president of the board, and two members of the board appointed by the president.⁶ In 1900 a change in the law made a committee consisting of the president and four members of the board of education responsible for examining, certificating, employing, classifying, and promoting teachers.⁷ In the report for 1902 the president, writing on the change, stated that the new rule was not a reflection on the superintendent.⁸ The change was explained on the basis of the inability of the superintendent to follow carefully the work of nine hundred teachers.⁹ The president also expressed the opinion that while the recommendations of the superintendent and principals should be respected they could not be taken as final and conclusive.¹⁰ If the recommendations were taken as final and conclusive, the president considered that the board would be deprived of one

¹Ibid.

²Fifty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Rochester, pp. 36-37. Rochester: Board of Education, 1904.

³Ibid., p. 37.

⁴Milwaukee Public Schools, Annual Report of the Board of School Directors of the City of Milwaukee, pp. 28-30. Milwaukee: Board of School Directors, 1898.

⁵Ibid., p. 29.

⁶Ibid., p. 30.

⁷Ibid., pp. 73-74, 1901.

⁸Ibid., pp. 26-27, 1902.

⁹Ibid., p. 27.

¹⁰Ibid.

of the very functions for which it was created.¹ Finally, in 1904, after the board of education had been reduced to twelve members, the report stated that the board had established the sound policy of giving to the superintendent the assignment and appointment of teachers.²

The regulations of the public school system of Atlanta for 1912 contained an unusual provision with respect to the appointment of teachers.³ The superintendent was required to recommend all principals, assistant principals, teachers, and supernumeraries before their election to any position in the schools.⁴ If any recommendation was rejected by the board, the superintendent was required to continue to make other recommendations until one was made that was approved by the board.⁵ The superintendent was directed to make all assignments of teachers subject to the approval of the board.⁶ In case the assignments were not approved by the board he was to continue to make other assignments until the board's approval was secured.⁷ The regulations in reality gave the superintendent very little authority.

It is difficult to determine the definite time at which the superintendent of the schools of Chicago was made responsible for the recommendation of teachers. In the report for 1890 the president of the board of education made the statement that the board should give more weight to the recommendations of the superintendent respecting the qualifications and efficiency of teachers.⁸ The revision of the rules and regulations of the schools enacted in 1891 made no mention of the superintendent's responsibility for recommending teachers.⁹ The report of the schools for 1903 mentioned the preparation of a list of teachers on which the order of ranking was based on the grades made in examinations for certificates by graduates of the Chicago normal school.¹⁰ The superintendent in the report for 1903 also mentioned the elimination of

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 26-27, 1904-5.

³Thirty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 88-89. Atlanta: Board of Education, 1912.

⁴Ibid., p. 88.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 17-18. Chicago: Board of Education, 1890.

⁹Ibid., pp. 14-16, 1891.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 17-18, 1903.

"pull" through the use of the merit list.¹

The board of examiners for the schools of Chicago was constituted in 1921. The examinations were thereby taken out of the hands of the board of education and given to a body specifically designated for the purpose.² The appointments of teachers were to be made on merit only and from the lists certified by the board of education.³

The development of the responsibilities of the superintendent of New York in the appointment of teachers was also difficult to determine. As early as 1855 the superintendent was required to license teachers.⁴ This was an unusual responsibility to be given to a superintendent at that early date. In the report of the schools for 1912 mention was made of the fact that the board of superintendents had recommended the nomination of 1,568 teachers.⁵ The nominations were made from the eligible lists provided by the board of examiners.⁶ The board of examiners was created by the first Greater New York Charter in 1898.⁷ The superintendent of schools was the chairman of the board of examiners when it was first created, but the 1920 Legislature eliminated him from membership on the board.⁸ The present board of examiners of the New York schools is composed of seven persons who receive their appointments through civil service examinations.⁹

Summary

The early superintendents found, in most cities, a cumbersome and inefficient school administrative organization, which had been established when the school system was small and had been added to piece by piece as the city and the school system grew larger. The members of boards of education were appointed or elected for brief terms. In a number of cities the entire personnel of the board was changed annually or biennially. The term of the superintendent was also short, frequently one or two years

¹Ibid., p. 18.

²Ibid., pp. 74-75, 1925.

³Ibid., p. 75.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, p. 5. New York: Board of Education, 1855.

⁵Ibid., p. 213, 1912.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., pp. 14-17, 1922-23.

⁸Ibid., p. 16, 1923.

⁹Manual and Directory of the New York City Schools, pp. 8-11. New York: Board of Education, 1929.

in length. Successful school administration demands a policy of long time planning. The inadequate tenure of the superintendent and members of the board of education precluded long time planning. Frequently the city charter or the laws of the states gave the city council so much veto power over the actions of boards of education that the boards were seriously handicapped.

The early boards of education were large and were elected on the basis of ward representation. Two glaring evils developed from this method of election. The large size of the boards seemed to make imperative the establishment of a large number of standing committees. Representation by wards tended to lead the boards into sectional endeavors. The wards which had strong and active representation on the board of education secured an amount of funds and school facilities which the less favored wards were unable to receive.

The large number of committees hindered the performance of even routine matters. Business referred to committees would remain unfinished because of neglect or lack of dispatch. This delay frequently interfered with the successful operation of the school system. Another undesirable feature of the standing committee organization lay in the fact that some committees felt it incumbent on them both to legislate and to administer. Lay committees were, in this manner, performing professional duties for which the school district was paying a professionally trained executive.

Gradually through experience and through the aid and advice of the professionally trained leader the administrative organizations were modified. One of the biggest factors in the modification was the growth of confidence in the superintendent. That officer, through experience and through study, was recognized and respected by the lay boards of education. The delegation of powers and duties to the superintendent of schools usually transcended the laws made to govern such delegations. The superintendent who proved by his accomplishments that he was capable and reliable had responsibilities added to his quota.

The first essential step in the reorganization of the administrative machinery of school systems was the reduction in the size of the board of education. When the boards were reduced in size, the number of committees was also reduced. This change made it necessary to entrust more responsibilities to the superintendent. The superintendent became the executive officer of the board of education. The reduction of the size of the board of education changed the manner of selection of the membership. Members were elected from the city at large, rather than from wards. The elimination of ward representation on the board of education eliminated

an evil of long standing. Teachers were no longer nominated by members of boards of education in return for political or personal favors but were recommended by the superintendent of schools. The two major responsibilities gained by the superintendent through the reorganization of boards of education were the full right to be called the executive officer of the board of education and the privilege of nominating teachers.

CHAPTER VII

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS ACQUIRED THROUGH THE EXPANSION OF THE SCHOOL PROGRAM

Changes in Length of School Course

One of the first duties that devolved upon the city superintendent was the preparation of a course of study for a graded system of schools. Course of study making is a perennial problem, since courses of study can never be allowed to become static. The use of the first courses of study which were developed for graded schools revealed a number of shortcomings which were not apparent when the courses were constructed. The courses were developed during a transitional period in school gradation. The change from an ungraded to a graded school organization was a major one. There were a number of important adjustments to be made both in the teaching and in the administrative practices. These adjustments could not all be made at one time, and the necessity for making all of the adjustments was not apparent at any one time.

It was difficult to determine, for instance, how many years should be spent on the work of the elementary schools. The solution of this problem was intensified by apparent inflexibility of the graded organization. The best way in which to determine the most satisfactory number of years was through trial and an analysis of the results of the trial. Consequently the superintendents of schools found it necessary, in a number of cities, to make readjustments in the length of the elementary school course. Each adjustment in the length of the course meant a revision of the course of study and a reallocation of materials and work to be covered in the several grades or years of the course.

The urge for change and the consequent adjustments came from several sources. Teachers who were not yet thoroughly convinced that the new type courses of study were advisable made some of the requests. Groups of citizens in some cases were responsible for urging the changes. In other cases the superintendents recognized the necessity for change. While the initial urge for making the change might come from several sources, the actual responsibility for making the change rested on the superintendent of schools and his staff. This was inevitable since the superintendent had

been chosen, in most cases, to assume responsibility for the program of instruction. The necessity for change was just as inevitable. The only way in which a satisfactory time allotment could be reached, during this period of transition, was through trial. The following section shows the revisions which were made in several cities. The materials indicate that the superintendent of schools was the central figure in the adoption and execution of the changes.

The superintendent of Rochester in the report for 1855 discussed some of the changes in the grading of the schools which had been proposed by a committee appointed for the task. One change suggested was that of establishing better qualifications for transfer from one school division to another.¹ The schools were divided into primary, intermediate, and senior departments. The superintendent stated that if the change were made it would be necessary to adopt a uniform course of study.² The report for 1870 contained the announcement that a very radical change had been made in the course of study during the previous year.³ The number of grades had been changed from seven to nine. The superintendent was satisfied that the changed course of study would prove satisfactory. In the report for 1885 the superintendent commented on the length of the elementary school course. Ten years were required to complete the work of the elementary school.⁴ The superintendent declared that he had been of the opinion for a long time that the course could be completed in nine years, and that during the previous year a revision of the course had been made to bring the work within nine years.⁵

The report of Rochester for 1887 contains the statement that the elementary course of study had recently been revised and extended to ten years.⁶ The superintendent, according to the report, did not wholly approve the change, but had signed the recommendation of the committee on revision out of deference to the judgment of some of the more experienced teachers and principals.⁷ In 1894 the course of study of the elementary schools was reduced to nine years.⁸ In the report for 1900-1901-1902

¹Annual Report of Superintendent of Schools of the City of Rochester, pp. 16-17. Rochester: Board of Education, 1855.

²Ibid., p. 17.

³Ibid., p. 30, 1870.

⁴Ibid., pp. 82-83, 1885.

⁵Ibid., p. 83.

⁶Ibid., p. 66, 1887.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., p. 3, 1894.

announcement was made that the elementary course of study had been shortened to eight years.¹ The nine-year course, in the opinion of the superintendent, led to dawdling on the part of pupils and teachers and eight years was also the average time devoted to the elementary school course throughout the country. It was expected that some difficulties would be encountered for several years in making the change; however, the ultimate satisfaction of the new course was expected to offset the difficulties.²

In 1862 the course of study in the elementary school of San Francisco was ten years in length.³ The superintendent contended that too much time was devoted to the work of the elementary schools.⁴ In the report for 1868, he discussed the revision of the elementary course of study, which has just been completed and which provided ten grades in the elementary schools -- six in the primary, and four in the grammar schools.⁵ The course was so designed that it might be completed in eight years by the brightest pupils. In June, 1897, the classification committee of the board of education of San Francisco requested the superintendent to prepare a new course of study, based on four years for the primary schools, four years for the grammar schools, and four years for the high schools.⁶ The course was prepared and the work of the elementary schools was reduced from nine to eight years.⁷ The proposed change aroused so much opposition that, in September, 1897, the former nine-year course was readopted.

A new course of study for the schools of Columbus was adopted in 1872. The old course was nine years in length and was divided into five grades, which had been given the following designations: lower and higher primary; lower and higher secondary; lower and higher intermediate and A, B, and C grammar.⁸ The superintendent stated that two terms of the school year had been required to make the adjustment from the old to the new course of study.⁹

¹Ibid., pp. 48-49, 1900-1901-1902.

²Ibid., p. 49, 1902.

³Eleventh Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools of the City and County of San Francisco, p. 29. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1862.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 26, 1868.

⁶Ibid., p. 18, 1898.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 12. Columbus: Board of Education, 1872.

⁹Ibid.

The superintendent of Cincinnati in the report for 1861 devoted considerable space to the discussion of the new course of study, which he felt was too difficult in some places.¹ A large number of pupils were compelled to remain in grades B and A of the intermediate school for three years instead of two, as the course implied.² The course was designed to cover six years -- four grades, A, B, C, and D, were in the primary schools and two grades, A and B, were in the intermediate schools. The regulations provided that the course of instruction, the outline of which was not fixed by authorized textbooks, should be defined by a syllabus prepared by the superintendent of schools.³ As late as 1901 it was necessary to readjust the course of study because of changes in grading. In that year the plan of semi-annual promotions was adopted and the course of study was arranged in sixteen rather than in eight divisions.⁴

In the report of Chicago for 1874 the superintendent referred to the fact that the Department of Superintendence at its annual meeting held in 1873 had determined to attempt a more uniform gradation of the schools.⁵ He stated that it had been discovered that in Chicago, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Detroit, and Cleveland the requisites for admission to the high schools were practically the same; also the amount of time spent in the grades below the high school was about the same.⁶ The superintendent recommended that whenever the time came for a revision of the course of study a year's work be assigned to a grade and the grades be reduced from ten to eight.⁷

The superintendent of Baltimore in the report for 1886 declared that the revision of the course of study to make possible the completion of the work of one grade each year had been highly beneficial.⁸

The superintendent of New Haven in 1866 recommended lengthening the seven-year elementary school course of study one

¹Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, pp. 21-23. Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1861.

²Ibid., p. 21.

³Ibid., p. 23.

⁴Ibid., pp. 33-34, 1901.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 23-24. Chicago: Board of Education, 1874.

⁶Ibid., p. 24.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Annual Report of Board of Commissioners of Public Schools, pp. 44-45. Baltimore: Board of Commissioners, 1886.

year.¹ He felt that twelve-year-old pupils were too young to enter high school, since about twenty-three per cent of the pupils found it necessary to take more than seven years to do the work of the course. This finding led the superintendent to believe that the time was too short.²

In the report for 1877-78 the superintendent of Nashville discussed the change that had been effected in the elementary school course in that city. A few years previously the course had been expanded into twelve grades. The introduction of drawing and music was given as the reason for the change.³ Experience had proved, however, that it had not been necessary to add the twelfth year and the year had been eliminated. Later it was discovered that another year could be saved and the course was reduced to ten years. This last reduction had been brought about from the feeling on the part of parents, pupils, and teachers that there was not enough work allotted for each yearly grade.⁴ During the previous year the plan of having some pupils do two years' work in one had been tried, and the experiment had met with so much success that the reduction of the length of the course had been made.⁵

At the time of the consolidation of the boroughs which now form greater New York there was a marked discrepancy in the lengths of the elementary courses of study in use.⁶ The course in Manhattan and the Bronx was seven years in length, that in Brooklyn, Queens, and Richmond was eight years.⁷ In order to harmonize the work, the superintendent recommended that a uniform course of study be prepared by the administration and that all schools be required to conform. The suggestion of the superintendent evidently did not meet with complete approval, for in the report of the next year, 1900, he stated that the course was not yet uniform.⁸ Finally, in the report for 1902 the announcement was made that the board of education had decided on a uniform eight-year course.⁹ The superintendent was of the opinion that

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education of the New Haven City School District, p. 33. New Haven: Board of Education, 1866.

²Ibid.

³Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, pp. 20-21. Nashville: Board of Education, 1878.

⁴Ibid., p. 20.

⁵Ibid., p. 21.

⁶Annual Report of the Department of Education of the City of New York, pp. 119-20. New York: Board of Education, 1899.

⁷Ibid., p. 120.

⁸Ibid., p. 78, 1900.

⁹Ibid., p. 78, 1902.

not only could the present subjects be better taught but that also the course could be enriched by the inclusion of additional subjects.¹

In November, 1896, the board of education of Salt Lake City appointed a committee to inquire into the advisability of shortening the course of study to seven years.² After careful investigation and study of the problem the committee recommended that the course remain eight years in length as it then was.

In contrast to this decision the report of the superintendent for 1910 made the announcement that the course in Dallas had been shortened from eight to seven years.³ The reason given was that as much work could be done in seven years as was then being done in eight if the proper pressure was put on the pupils and teachers. No condensation was attempted below the fourth grade.⁴

The Enlargement of the Course of Study

The course of study of the early elementary schools was meager in its offerings if judged by present day standards. Reading, writing, arithmetic, spelling, geography, and history were usually the required subjects. If the course of study is to meet the changing demands of society it must be flexible. The only conditions under which a static course of study could be considered satisfactory would be in a static social organization. The rudimentary course of study in use in the early elementary schools was probably satisfactory for the social organization which it served.

Social and economic changes in the lives and interests of the people served by the public schools made changes in the course of study necessary. Some of the demands for changes came from social groups and some came from the superintendents of schools. The alert superintendent of schools is sentient to the needs of the community served by the schools which he administers. Not only must he directly initiate movements which are pointed toward making the program of the school more nearly meet the community requirements but he must foster also worthy movements which are initiated by groups of the community.

¹Ibid.

²Annual Report of Public Schools, pp. 80-84. Salt Lake City: Board of Education, 1897.

³Annual Report of the Public Schools, pp. 16-17. Dallas: Board of Education, 1910.

⁴Ibid., p. 17.

The following section discloses some of the responsibilities which the superintendents have exercised in the expansion of the school program. In most of the cities included in the analysis the superintendent recommended and urged the inclusion of the new subjects. In one city the superintendent worked with a number of civic organizations of the city on an expansion of the school program. In another city the superintendent asked for sufficient time in which to analyze and evaluate the urgings of groups of citizens. It is obvious that the inclusion of the new subjects increased the powers and duties of the superintendents of schools. It was necessary for the program of studies to be adjusted in order to provide time for the new subjects, a course of study for the new subjects had to be prepared. Frequently, as was the case with home economics, manual training and physical education, new equipment had to be purchased and installed. In fact in the case of manual training the erection of a new building was sometimes necessary. After the new subjects had been incorporated into the program of studies several years of readjustment were required in order that the new subjects might become an integral part of the program of studies. The supervisory responsibility essential in unifying the program of studies devolved on the superintendent and his staff.

The superintendent of Denver in the report for 1904-1905 stated very tersely the reasons for the addition of new subjects:

"The course of study is not accidental: music, drawing, physical culture, sewing, domestic science, manual training, kindergarten work now offered in the public schools are the result of evolution of public opinion and the development of special industrial and intellectual conditions unknown twenty-five years ago."¹

In the report of the Denver schools for 1885 the superintendent expressed the opinion that manual training should be taught as a private enterprise.² The work, if done at public expense, should supplement the present course of study and should not be a substitute for any part of it.³ The subsequent development of work in manual training proved the correctness of the point of view.

In the report for 1898 the superintendent of Chicago commented on the changes which had taken place in the course of study since he had become superintendent of the Chicago schools in

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education of School District Number One in the City and County of Denver, p. 7. Denver: Board of Education, 1905.

²Ibid., p. 65, 1885.

³Ibid.

1891.¹ Provision had been made for the study of history beginning at the fourth grade. English, history, and algebra had been added to the eighth grade. Lessons in elementary science were given in each grade. Latin had been made an optional study in seventh and eighth grades. Vertical penmanship had been added. Kindergartens had been established as a part of the schools. Steps had been taken to provide instruction in domestic science, cooking, and sewing for the girls of the seventh and eighth grades. A training school for teachers had been established in September, 1893.²

At a meeting of the board of education held August 11, 1865, a resolution was passed providing that instructions in the German language be introduced as an experiment in the Washington school in Chicago as soon as at least sixty pupils had signified their desire to pursue such a course.³ At the end of the year the committee on German of the board of education reported that the enrolment in the German class had reached 115.⁴ The report for 1882 stated that during the previous school year 4,996 grammar school pupils and 366 high school pupils had received instruction in German.⁵ Thirty-nine teachers had been employed to teach German, and the average cost per pupil in the grammar schools had been \$4.68.⁶ The report for 1886 gave the number of pupils as 28,034.⁷ The instruction at that time extended from the third to the twelfth grades. The superintendent was certain that the study of German did not retard the progress of pupils in other subjects.⁸ He was more inclined to believe that the study of German quickened the ability of the pupils in the other subjects.⁹ In 1918 the superintendent recommended that the teaching of foreign languages be discontinued in the elementary schools, and the recommendation was approved by the board of education.¹⁰

On March 19, 1840, the Ohio Legislature amended the charter of Cincinnati requiring the board of education to provide German schools.¹¹ These schools were for the instruction of such

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 121.

Chicago: Board of Education, 1898.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 54-55, 1866.

⁴Ibid., p. 55.

⁵Ibid., p. 20, 1882.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 55, 1886.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 11-12, 1918.

¹¹Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, pp. 94-95. Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1876.

pupils as desired to learn the German language and the German and English languages together.¹ In 1850 the number of children in the German schools was 10 per cent of the total enrolment. By 1870, 38 per cent of the total enrolment, and by 1876, 51.5 per cent were in the German schools.² The report for 1908 stated that the study of German was optional in all of the grades. The maximum amount of time given to it was 540 minutes a week in the first four grades and one hour per day in the four upper grades.³ At that time all but one elementary school in the city conducted classes in German. In 1872 a German-English department was added to the Cincinnati Normal School for the purpose of training teachers for the German schools of the city.⁴

The report of the Cincinnati schools for 1897 made the announcement that algebra had been added to the course of studies for the eighth year and that it had taken part of the time formerly devoted to mental arithmetic.⁵ In the report for 1900 the superintendent recommended the establishment of work in manual training for the elementary schools and the organization of a commercial course in the high schools.⁶ The report for 1901 discussed a continuation of the efforts to have manual training made a part of the school course, conferences having been held with the leading business, commercial, and social clubs of the city, with the women's clubs, and the central labor council.⁷ The superintendent felt that favorable sentiment was growing and that it would not be long before the work would be introduced, since elementary handwork had already been introduced into the grade schools and was proving most satisfactory. Manual training and domestic science were introduced into the seventh and eighth grades during the school term of 1905-1906.⁸ At about the same time a demand was made for the introduction of the work into the fifth and sixth grades. Kindergartens were made a part of the public school system in September, 1905.⁹

The superintendent of Columbus in the report for 1887 recommended that manual training be introduced into the schools.¹⁰

¹Ibid., p. 94.

²Ibid., p. 95.

³Ibid., p. 51, 1908.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., pp. 19-20, 1897.

⁶Ibid., pp. 39-40, 1900.

⁷Ibid., p. 43, 1901.

⁸Ibid., pp. 58-61, 1906.

⁹Ibid., p. 59.

¹⁰Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 162-63.
Columbus: Board of Education, 1887.

He made the assertion that if the board of education did not soon voluntarily introduce manual training into the schools the people would compel its introduction.¹ The report for 1894 indicated that manual training work for the boys and domestic science work for the girls had been introduced into the upper grammar grades.² The report for 1906 gave the plans for a more extensive introduction of manual training into the schools.³ These plans included the introduction of industrial arts into the first four grades and the extension of this work to the boys and girls of grades five and six. For the last six grades, the ultimate program was to include shop work for the boys of grade seven and eight and domestic science for the girls of those grades. This work was to be extended into the high school and later, as soon as funds could be provided, a complete manual training high school was to be established.⁴

In the report of Cleveland for 1872 the superintendent stated that every year made new demands on the schools.⁵ As a result of the demands, music, physics, gymnastics, and drawing had successfully been added to the course of study. The superintendent made a plea for the introduction of the kindergarten, claiming that it would furnish a vital connection between the home and the school.

Manual training and domestic science were begun at first as private enterprises in Cleveland. In February, 1885, a small carpenter shop was started in a barn, which led in June, 1885, to the incorporation of the Cleveland Manual Training School Company with a capital of \$25,000.⁶ Tuition was free to pupils of the Cleveland schools, a charge being made for materials only; to all other pupils the tuition was fifteen dollars per term in advance.⁷ In the fall of 1884 a few ladies opened a Kitchen Garden in one of the basement rooms of Unity Church in Cleveland, which led, two years later, to the incorporation of the Cleveland Domestic Training Association.⁸ In September, 1887, this school became a branch of the Cleveland Manual Training School, and the Cleveland board of education appropriated a sum of money to provide for the teach-

¹Ibid., p. 163.

²Ibid., p. 250, 1894.

³Ibid., p. 94, 1906.

⁴Ibid., p. 98.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 60-61.

Cleveland: Board of Education, 1872.

⁶Ibid., pp. 27-28, 1887.

⁷Ibid., p. 28.

⁸Ibid., p. 29.

ing of classes from the public schools.¹

The report of the superintendent of Cleveland for 1894 gives an account of the extension of manual training in the schools of that city.² In the four primary grades the work included clay modeling, paper folding, paper and cardboard construction. In the fifth and sixth grades simple forms were cut from wood by the boys, while the girls were given simple needle work. In the seventh and eighth grades the boys were given light bench work and the girls plain cooking.³ Two manual training schools for high school boys had also been established.⁴ The superintendent further reported that simple science work had been carried into the elementary schools and elementary history had been placed farther down in the grades.⁵

The report of Detroit for 1864 announced that a system of free gymnastics had been introduced into most of the schools of the city.⁶ In 1872 the superintendent mentioned the possibility of the people of the city demanding that drawing be taught in the schools, and he recommended that the next special teacher needed was one of reading and elocution.⁷ A commercial course was established in the Detroit high school in 1882.⁸ The board of education had difficulty in securing funds from the city council for the establishment of manual training recommended by the superintendent in his report for 1887-1888. The appropriation asked for was \$60,000 for a manual training school and \$10,000 for the establishment of kindergartens. The continued refusal of the city council to supply the money caused the president of the board of education to suggest that Saturday morning classes in freehand drawing and modeling be held for the boys and Saturday afternoon classes in needle work, cutting, and fitting for the girls.⁹ In 1893 some of the citizens offered the Detroit board of education \$100,000 to establish a school for manual training. The offer was refused in spite of the recommendation of the superintendent that it be accepted.¹⁰ Manual training was

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 53-55, 1894.

³Ibid., p. 54.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 56.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 50.

Detroit: Board of Education, 1864.

⁷Ibid., p. 63, 1872.

⁸Ibid., p. 11, 1883-84.

⁹Ibid., p. 20, 1887-88.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 36-37, 1893.

finally introduced into the schools in 1898,¹ and was extended to two of the high schools in 1905.² In 1896 the normal course was extended to include training for teachers of kindergartens which were established in Detroit in 1897.

St. Louis established the first public school kindergarten in the United States in 1873.³ In 1886 a number of citizens urged that manual training be introduced into the schools.⁴ The superintendent was not convinced that the plans submitted gave promise of practical success and asked for time to formulate plans of his own. During the school year 1890-91 manual training was introduced as an experiment into the seventh and eighth grades of L'Ouverture School of St. Louis, a school for colored children.⁵ The work was extended to three other schools during the 1899-1900 school term.⁶

The citizens of Rochester were fortunate in having the Mechanics Institute located in the city. In the report for 1885 the superintendent of Rochester strongly urged that mechanical and industrial drawing be added to the course of study.⁷ As a result of the influence of Mechanics Institute, the recommendation of the superintendent was carried out during the next year, 1886.⁸ In 1887 a free kindergarten was established under the direction of the Institute in a room furnished by the school district.⁹ Manual training was begun in the fourth grade of the schools in 1897; the same year sewing was added to the course of study for the girls of the fourth grades.¹⁰ By 1903 manual training was so well established that the boys of the seventh and eighth grades were given two hours of work in the subject weekly.¹¹

Physical training was added to the course of study of the schools of Rochester in 1903.¹² Two teachers were employed for

¹Ibid., p. 69, 1899.

²Ibid., pp. 94-95, 1905.

³Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, p. 81. St. Louis: Board of Directors, 1876.

⁴Ibid., pp. 19-20, 1886.

⁵Ibid., pp. 111-12, 1893.

⁶Ibid., p. 135, 1900.

⁷Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 82-83. Rochester: Board of Education, 1885.

⁸Ibid., p. 78, 1886.

⁹Ibid., p. 75, 1887.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 23, 1898.

¹¹Ibid., p. 9, 1903-4.

¹²Ibid., p. 24, 1909-10.

the work in 1909 and four additional teachers were added the next year to prepare the children for participation in the National Physical Education Congress held in Rochester in June of that year.¹ During the same year, 1910, a citizen interested in the German Turnverein offered to employ an instructor in physical education for the largest German school in the city and the offer was accepted.²

The superintendent of the schools of Providence in the report for 1866 recommended that a daily exercise in penmanship should be given in all of the intermediate and grammar schools of the city.³ Military training was recommended for the larger boys of the schools in the report for 1867. The superintendent contended that military training afforded better physical development than any system of gymnastics.⁴ In the report for 1877 the superintendent recommended that sewing be taught to the older girls in the grammar schools. It was then being taught to more than a thousand girls in the intermediate and primary schools.⁵ A class in mechanical and industrial drawing was established in the high school in 1882.⁶ The Providence trade school was opened in May, 1918, with courses offered in printing, painting, electricity, woodwork, and automobile repair.⁷

Physiology and history of the United States were first taught in the schools of Kansas City during the 1869-1870 term.⁸ In the report for 1895 the superintendent mentioned a rapidly growing sentiment in favor of manual training and the kindergarten, both of which movements he hoped would soon be incorporated into the schools.⁹ The report for 1897 gave the information that kindergartens had been established during that year in two of the school buildings.¹⁰ In 1901 manual training was introduced into two of the schools. The work included clay modeling, paper folding, weaving with zephyr yarn, raffia, and rattan, cardboard construction, bent iron work, bench work, and printing.¹¹ The

¹Ibid., p. 25.

²Ibid.

³Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Providence, p. 25. Providence: School Committee, 1866.

⁴Ibid., p. 16, 1867.

⁵Ibid., p. 21, 1877.

⁶Ibid., p. 33, 1882.

⁷Ibid., p. 35, 1917-18.

⁸Seventh Annual Report of the Kansas City Public Schools, p. 25. Kansas City: Board of Education, 1878.

⁹Ibid., pp. 25-27, 1895.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 45, 1897.

¹¹Annual Report of Kansas City Public Schools, p. 63. Kansas City: Board of Education, 1901.

superintendent was of the opinion that the work in manual training and domestic science should be done in a manual training high school.¹ In 1911 manual training was conducted in thirty centers for boys, and cooking and sewing in twenty-eight centers for girls.²

In the report for 1859 the superintendent of San Francisco stated that the addition of physical education and vocal music to the course of study had contributed much to the health of the pupils.³ The suggestion that a kindergarten be established with each primary school in the city was made in the report for 1880.⁴ The superintendent indicated in the report for 1894 that several additions to the course of study were the leading objectives of his administration. The subjects he wished to add were a system of permanship, cooking, and manual training.⁵ Among the changes necessary to the improvement of the schools in 1900 were listed the introduction of manual training, including sloyd, cooking, and sewing, and the introduction of nature study.⁶

The report of the superintendent of New York for 1887 discussed in some detail the method he had used in making his investigations into the advisability of introducing industrial education into the schools.⁷ He had three questions in mind as the investigations were made:

- (1) Is the discipline of manual training profitable and applicable to all the various grades of pupils in the common schools or are its advantages necessarily confined to the limited number who reach the grammar school grade and the high schools and colleges?
- (2) What effect, if any, has the introduction of this new subject had upon the proficiency of the pupils in the other departments of instruction?
- (3) Would the necessary additional expense be relatively small or would it add unduly to the cost of public instruction?⁸

¹Ibid., p. 104.

²Ibid., pp. 35-36, 1911.

³Ninth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools of the City and County of San Francisco, p. 6. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1859.

⁴Ibid., p. 731, 1880.

⁵Ibid., p. 55, 1894.

⁶Ibid., p. 20, 1900.

⁷Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, p. 145. New York: Board of Education, 1887.

⁸Ibid., p. 144.

The answers to the questions were encouraging and a favorable report was made to the board of education, which was unanimously adopted by the board and a course of study for the subject, together with a teacher's manual, was to be prepared.¹ The course was tried in six male and six female departments of grammar schools but not until the trustees of the board had made application for its adoption.² The superintendent stated that the work of preparing the new course and manual were tasks of great difficulty. It was necessary not only to give explicit directions for teaching the subject but also to readjust the time schedule for the entire course of study in order to find time for the new subject.³ Finally, according to the report for 1888, a manual training course was that year introduced into four male grammar schools, five female grammar schools, and the eleven primary departments and primary schools connected with them.⁴

Compulsory School Attendance

The enactment of compulsory school attendance laws brought a number of problems for the superintendent of schools to solve. Perhaps the most common problems were those involved in adjusting the program of studies to meet the needs of the children who were forced into school by the enactment of the laws. Many of the children were over-age for the grade in which they were placed. This fact made their presence in the grade undesirable and it was necessary for the superintendents to establish ungraded or special classes for these children. The over-ageness of the truant children made necessary the establishment of special programs of study with emphasis on manual training and other types of industrial work. Some of the children were potential or actual criminals and their presence in a schoolroom with normal progress children was undesirable. In a number of cities it was necessary for the superintendent to urge the establishment of parental schools for this group of children.

The duties devolving on the superintendents in connection with truant children were of several types. The urging of the superintendents of schools, in many cities, was responsible for the passage or modification of compulsory attendance laws. After the laws were passed the organization for their enforcement was directed by the superintendent. When the children were brought

¹Ibid., p. 145.

²Ibid., pp. 145-46.

³Ibid., p. 146.

⁴Ibid., p. 41, 1888.

into the schools the superintendent was compelled to provide quarters for them and to modify the program of studies to suit their needs. The materials of this section give an account of some of the responsibilities of the superintendent with respect to the enactment of compulsory school attendance laws.

The superintendent of the schools of Denver in the report for 1907-1908 made a number of comments on the compulsory attendance law in operation in Colorado at that time.¹ He had the opinion that child labor laws should be enforced by the juvenile court and not by the superintendent of schools.² In the report for 1909-1910 the superintendent stated that because of lack of funds the school district had not been able, as yet, to establish a special school for truant children.³

After the legislature of Illinois had enacted a compulsory school attendance law in 1864, the superintendent of the Chicago schools recommended that, as soon as possible, three or four truant officers be appointed to visit regularly the sections of the city where habitual truants were likely to congregate.⁴ The school report for 1889 mentioned the passage of a new compulsory school attendance law. Under the provisions of this act the school districts were required to appoint truant officers who were ordered to arrest truant children and place them in charge of the teacher of the school to which the children belonged.⁵ The teacher of the school was expected to instruct the children in such studies as they were fitted to pursue.⁶ The superintendent believed that since the city was equipped with a parental school a very wholesome attitude was developing toward the education of truant and incorrigible and delinquent children.

In 1903 the legislature of Illinois passed a child labor law, which prohibited the employment of children under fourteen years of age at remunerative labor.⁷ Before a child between the ages of fourteen and sixteen years could be employed, he was required to present an age and school certificate issued by the superintendent of schools. The superintendent could not legally issue the certificate until he had a school certificate signed by

¹Annual Report of School District Number One in the City and County of Denver, pp. 9-10. Denver: Board of Education, 1908.

²Ibid., p. 10.

³Ibid., p. 13, 1909-10.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 29-31.
Chicago: Board of Education, 1865.

⁵Ibid., p. 29, 1889.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., pp. 43-45, 1904.

the child's teacher or principal certifying that the child could read and write simple sentences.¹

The legislature of Ohio enacted a compulsory school attendance law effective January 1, 1890.² The law provided that all children of school age and under fourteen years were required to attend school for a certain length of time during the school year.³ In the report for 1906 the superintendent of Cincinnati included a list of improvements to the school system either under way or contemplated, among which was a special school for reclaiming truants and pupils seemingly incorrigible.⁴ The report for 1908 mentioned the establishment of a special school for boys to which were sent truants and incorrigibles who were not amenable to ordinary disciplinary measures. The school was equipped for instruction in manual training, and contained a lunchroom, a gymnasium, and beds for the detention of the worst cases. The report stated that the boys liked the school, which was under the charge of a matron and three male teachers.⁵

The superintendent of Detroit in the report for 1879 called attention to the fact that in the report for 1876 he had asked for some means to combat truancy and youthful vagrancy.⁶ In the report for 1881-1882 the superintendent again called attention to the lack of measures designed to combat truancy.⁷ A compulsory school attendance law for Detroit was passed in 1883. The report of the superintendent for 1883-1884 discussed the establishment of an ungraded school for truants and incorrigibles.⁸ In 1897 the superintendent recommended that additional ungraded schools be established.⁹ By 1911 the number of ungraded schools had reached nine. The course of study for these schools included two hours of manual training per week, with the remainder of the time devoted to intensely practical aspects of the academic subjects.¹⁰ It was not the intention to help children in these schools indefinitely. They were to be returned to their own

¹Ibid., p. 44.

²Annual Report of the School District, pp. 74-75. Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1891.

³Ibid., p. 75.

⁴Ibid., pp. 27-29, 1906.

⁵Ibid., p. 67, 1908.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 68. Detroit: Board of Education, 1879.

⁷Ibid., p. 52, 1882.

⁸Ibid., p. 62, 1883-84.

⁹Ibid., p. 80, 1897.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 120, 1911.

neighborhood schools just as soon as it was possible to do so.¹

In the report of the schools of Philadelphia for 1872 the statement was made that there were 20,000 vagrant children in the city, and a strong appeal was made for a compulsory school attendance law.² A stronger plea for a compulsory school attendance law was made in the report for 1874.³ Pennsylvania passed a compulsory school attendance law in 1895. In the report for 1898 the superintendent of Philadelphia recommended the establishment of special classes for the children who would be brought into school by the provisions of the law.⁴ He suggested that it was much better to establish special classes for the neglected children than to put them into the regular schools with children much younger than they were.⁵ In 1910 the superintendent recommended the establishment of a parental school for chronic truants and incorrigible children. At that time Philadelphia had established twenty-one classes for truant and incorrigible children.⁶

The superintendent of Omaha in the report for 1898 mentioned the inefficiency of the compulsory attendance laws of Nebraska.⁷ The law was without penalty for violation and failed to define the time limits for compulsory attendance. The superintendent recommended that the law should provide for the establishment of industrial schools for the training of truant children.⁸

The central labor union in 1884 addressed a communication to the board of education in Rochester requesting that the compulsory attendance law be enforced.⁹ The school policemen were unable to get a large number of the vagrant children into school because of the opposition and indifference of the parents. The superintendent estimated that from four to five thousand children were neither in school nor engaged in any useful employment and

¹Ibid., p. 120.

²Fifty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Public Education of the First School District of Pennsylvania Comprising the City of Philadelphia, p. 14. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1872.

³Ibid., p. 16, 1874.

⁴Ibid., p. 111, 1898.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 68, 1910.

⁷Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 58. Omaha: Board of Education, 1898.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 81-82. Rochester: Board of Education, 1885.

recommended that these children be collected and placed in an ungraded school.¹ In the report for 1888 the superintendent explained that a committee from the State Council of City Superintendents, under the advice of the State Superintendent, had drawn up a compulsory school attendance law.² The bill had been presented in the previous session of the legislature, but had not been enacted into a law due to the press of other business. This bill was finally passed in 1895 and under its provisions the city superintendents of schools were made responsible for the enforcement of the provisions of the law. Their authority extended over all of the schools of the district, both public and private.³ Special classes were organized in Rochester for truants and incorrigibles in 1904.⁴ The pupils were admitted to the schools only after the local school had used all its means to solve their problems, and admission was upon the joint recommendation of the principal of the school from which the pupil came, and that of the superintendent of schools.⁵

The superintendent of San Francisco in the report for 1878 recommended the establishment of a central truant school to carry out, in full, the provisions of a recently enacted compulsory school attendance law.⁶ This recommendation was renewed in the reports for 1901-1902,⁷ and 1902-1903.⁸ In the last report the superintendent made the statement that San Francisco would not have sufficient school accommodations if all of the truants and other children who were not attending school were forced into school immediately.⁹

Missouri passed a compulsory school attendance law in 1904.¹⁰ It was framed in such a way that the adoption of the provisions of the law was left to the option of local school districts. St. Louis accepted the provisions of the law and elected a truant officer and four assistants.¹¹ In the report for 1917

¹Ibid., p. 82.

²Ibid., p. 91, 1888.

³Ibid., p. 16, 1896.

⁴Ibid., p. 104, 1911-1912-1913.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, pp. 38-39. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1878.

⁷Ibid., p. 101, 1901-2.

⁸Ibid., pp. 195-96, 1902-3.

⁹Ibid., p. 196.

¹⁰Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 28-29. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1905.

¹¹Ibid., p. 29.

the superintendent stated that it was frequently impossible to handle troublesome boys because of the insufficiency of special classes, and recommended that such classes be established.¹ The report for 1920 designated the establishment of continuation schools as the most significant development of the school year.² The schools provided part-time classes for all persons between the ages of sixteen and eighteen who wished to attend.³ The superintendent reported that the instruction in these schools had to be organized from a point of view quite different from that of the regular schools.⁴

The school report of Los Angeles for 1897-1898 insisted that some provision should be made to educate the four or five thousand children of the city who were not attending school.⁵ The crowded condition of the schools was held to be somewhat responsible for the large number of truants. In the report for 1904 the superintendent commented on the good work that was being done by the parental school operated in connection with the detention home.⁶ He recommended that the school district employ an attendance officer and make some provisions for the education of the truant and incorrigible children.⁷

In the report for 1891 the superintendent of the schools of Providence advised the establishment of ungraded schools.⁸ This action had been made necessary by the recent revision of the compulsory school attendance laws.⁹

In the report for 1900 the superintendent of the Minneapolis schools stated that an ungraded school had been established to carry out the provisions of the compulsory attendance law.¹⁰ The school, according to the report, had not been highly successful owing to the fact that the attendance officer was doubtful as to the extent of his authority.¹¹

¹Ibid., p. 192, 1917.

²Ibid., p. 37, 1920.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., pp. 37-38.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education and Superintendent of City Schools with Rules and Regulations of the Public Schools of the City of Los Angeles, p. 12. Board of Education, 1898.

⁶Ibid., pp. 60-61, 1904.

⁷Ibid., p. 61.

⁸Annual Report of the Schools Committee of the City of Providence, p. 11. Providence: School Committee, 1891.

⁹Ibid., p. 54.

¹⁰Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Minneapolis, p. 71. Minneapolis: Board of Education, 1900.

¹¹Ibid.

New Types of Service for Deviate Children

Closely connected with and probably influenced by the establishment of ungraded or special schools for truant children was the movement to establish special schools for children who were mentally and physically handicapped. It seems possible that the enforcement of compulsory attendance laws, which brought most of the children of school age into school, tended to increase the number of deviate children attending school. Another factor responsible for the intensification of the problem was the large number of immigrant children who were coming to America. The United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Immigration, has supplied data on the number of immigrant children admitted to this country between 1900 and 1931. From 1901 to 1918, 1,743,367 children under fourteen years of age were admitted. From 1918 to 1931, 869,465 children under sixteen years of age were admitted.

The development of methods of cost analysis which made possible information regarding the waste of retardation and repetition probably exerted a potent influence in the establishment of special schools and classes. A study of Ayres, entitled Laggards in Our Schools, published in 1909, also created interest in deviate children. There were four significant findings of the Ayres study:

"(1) The most important causes of retardation of school children can be removed. (2) The old fashioned virtues of regularity of attendance and faithfulness are major elements of success. (3) Some cities are already accomplishing excellent results by measures that can be adopted by all. (4) Relatively few children are so defective as to prevent success in school life."¹

The establishment of special classes and schools to care for deviate children added materially to the duties and responsibilities of the superintendents of schools. In many cases special quarters had to be provided for these children. It was necessary for the superintendent to set up programs of studies which would meet the needs of the several types of deviates. If the difficulties of the children were to be diagnosed accurately an organization had to be formed for making the diagnosis. After the diagnosis had been made it was necessary for the superintendent to recruit a teaching staff for the special schools and classes. Provision had to be made for the continued education of the teachers provided. The following section will show some of

¹Leonard P. Ayres, Laggards in Our Schools, p. xv. New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1909.

the activities of the superintendents in connection with the education of deviate children.

In the report for 1910 the superintendent of the Cincinnati schools made some rather pertinent statements in connection with the new emphasis on the training of handicapped children.¹ He stated that in the early part of the decade attention had been given to the normal child, but in the last few years an increasing amount of attention was being given to non-typical children. "It is the duty of the State," wrote the superintendent, "to see that all are adequately prepared to be self-supporting and, if possible, contributing members of society."² Because of this responsibility it was necessary to segregate those whose needs were not met by mass instruction and adapt the instruction to their aptitudes and conditions. The report classified these children as foreigners, intellectual "longs and shorts," moral delinquents, and physical defectives.³

Providence was one of the first cities to recognize the needs of deviate or exceptional children. In the report for 1873 the superintendent advocated rapid promotion of pupils.⁴ He suggested that the grades should cover from three to six months of work. The next year, 1874, the superintendent recommended that the pupils who were compelled, by circumstances or by their parents, to take a short course should be accommodated in special rooms.⁵ The Providence report for 1875 recommended the establishment of an ungraded room chiefly for the benefit of the children of immigrants.⁶ These children had few school advantages and they needed, more than anything else, a knowledge of arithmetic and an ability to read, write, and spell with facility. In the report for 1903-1904 the superintendent suggested that steps be taken to establish separate schools for disciplinary cases, the slow mentality children, and the foreign children. These children had all been grouped in one room and he felt this was not a good arrangement.⁷ The report of the superintendent for 1911-1912 summarized the achievements and needs of the city in making provision

¹Annual Report of the Cincinnati Public Schools, p. 27.
Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1910.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Annual Report of the School District of Providence,
pp. 15-16. Providence: School Committee, 1873.

⁵Ibid., pp. 12-13, 1874.

⁶Ibid., pp. 13-14, 1875.

⁷Ibid., p. 26, 1903-4.

for the education of defective children.¹ The State had made provision for the deaf children at Rhode Island Institute for the Deaf. The superintendent suggested that either the state or the city should establish a school for the blind and the city should establish a school for crippled children. The first fresh air school in the United States had been opened at Providence in 1908, another was to open for the next school term, 1913. A class for the feeble-minded had been opened in 1896, a second class was organized in 1897, and two more in 1911. Accommodations for at least three hundred children were needed, and it was recommended that these classes be grouped in one building.²

The superintendent of New York, in the report for 1899, explained his plan for determining the number of mentally defective children in the schools of that city.³ He proposed to have the borough superintendents make a check through the teachers in their districts and when the number had been determined he would recommend plans to the board of education for the teaching of the children.⁴ The report for 1909 indicated that there were eighty-six ungraded classes for mentally defective children. The report further recommended that special classes for anaemic and sickly children be established.⁵

In the report for 1910 the superintendent showed that over-ageness in the schools of New York had been reduced from 28.4 per cent in 1909 to 26.1 per cent in 1910.⁶ This reduction had been brought about by the establishment of summer continuation classes for pupils not promoted in June, and in the organization of special classes into which over-age children had been sent for a term or two and given individual help.⁷ The percentage of over-ageness in the New York schools decreased from 26.1 per cent in 1910 to 23.3 per cent in 1911. The chief reasons assigned for reduction were the efforts made by teachers and principals to prepare the backward children for promotion.⁸ In 1915 the over-ageness had been reduced to 23 per cent.⁹

¹Ibid., pp. 19-23, 1911-12.

²Ibid., p. 23.

³Annual Report of the Department of Education of the City of New York, pp. 131-32. New York: Board of Education, 1899.

⁴Ibid., p. 132.

⁵Ibid., pp. 187-89, 1909.

⁶Ibid., p. 77, 1910.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., pp. 59-60, 1911.

⁹Ibid., p. 60, 1915.

The report of the superintendent of Cleveland for 1894 described a plan he had evolved for aiding slow pupils.¹ Instead of having pupils repeat the work of the grade, they were sent on to the next grade and given intensive teaching, in the hope that the deficiencies would be made up. In 1904 Cleveland established more than twenty classes for backward pupils in which the pupils were organized into small groups and given special instruction in their weak subjects.² The superintendent recommended an enlargement of the scope of the work and an extension of the time for doing it.³ Four schools for mentally defective children were organized in 1905, and the superintendent recommended the opening of four additional schools.⁴ The report for 1910 described the elementary industrial school which had recently been organized.⁵ Statistics had shown that 50 per cent of the children who entered the first grades of the Cleveland schools did not reach the sixth grade. The school was opened in an attempt to give some of these children a more practical kind of training.⁶ The requirements for admission were that the children should be at least two years behind grade and that they should either have finished or failed the sixth grade. The 1909 statistics of the schools showed that 28.5 per cent of the elementary pupils and 15 per cent of the high school pupils were behind their grades.⁷

The education of backward children in Detroit was directed by a child study committee, organized in 1910, by the superintendent of schools.⁸ The committee was made up of the president of the board of education, the superintendent of schools, the director of kindergartens, the supervisor of ungraded rooms, the supervisor of primary grades, the principal of the school for the deaf, and the general supervisor.⁹ One room for backward children was opened in 1901, and by 1912 there were nine rooms. In the report for 1913 the superintendent urged the establishment of a school for mental defectives, because he felt that the presence of these children in the rooms for backward children was exerting

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 71-72.

Cleveland: Board of Education, 1894.

²Ibid., pp. 37-38, 1904.

³Ibid., p. 38.

⁴Ibid., p. 82, 1905.

⁵Ibid., p. 60, 1910.

⁶Ibid., pp. 60-61.

⁷Ibid., p. 61.

⁸Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Detroit, p. 74. Detroit: Board of Education, 1912.

⁹Ibid.

a bad influence.¹ The special rooms were considered by the superintendent to have two functions: (1) They acted as clearing houses to eliminate low-grade children from the school. (2) They provided a place where children who were merely backward might be placed for a length of time in order that special assistance might be given them to make up grade work.²

In the report for 1910 the superintendent of Kansas City recommended that there should be a room set aside in every large elementary school for all pupils who did not fit well into the grades.³ These schools were intended to meet the needs of pupils who had been irregular in attendance, but who were not mental cases. The superintendent also recommended that workshops and classrooms be established for children who made very slow progress with their school work.⁴ The purpose in removing these children from the regular classrooms was to relieve the average pupils from being retarded by the presence of the retarded pupils and to give the retarded pupils a better opportunity.⁵ In addition to these classes it was recommended that special classes for the deaf, dumb, and blind be established.⁶ Among the needs of the schools listed in the report for 1913 were auxiliary classes for children who were temporarily ill-adjusted to grades, a school for tubercular and anaemic children, and a school for the feeble-minded.⁷

Ayres' study, Laggards in Our Schools, showed that New Orleans was sixty-first in a group of sixty-three large cities of the United States in its efficiency to retain pupils through the grades of the elementary schools.⁸ On May 25, 1911, 49 per cent of the pupils in the elementary schools of New Orleans were above normal age for their grade and 35.5 per cent were making slow progress.⁹ The chief causes of the retardation, the superintendent believed, were late entrance and irregular attendance.¹⁰ A child

¹Ibid., p. 69, 1913.

²Ibid., p. 78, 1912.

³Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the School District of Kansas City, pp. 142-43. Kansas City: Board of Education, 1910.

⁴Ibid., p. 142.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 35, 1913.

⁸Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Public Schools of the Parish of New Orleans, pp. 22-25. New Orleans: Board of Education, 1911.

⁹Ibid., pp. 22-23.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 23.

who entered the schools late was usually retarded throughout his school course. To help overcome the alarming amount of retardation, the kindergarten and first-grade teachers were required to spend their afternoons in giving special help to the backward children. Several suggestions were made by the superintendent in the hope of making an improvement in the conditions. One suggestion was to discontinue, by means of combining classes, small groups of pupils in the eighth grades and high school, so that teachers could be released for special work with retarded pupils. Another suggestion was the establishment of a special day school for feeble-minded children and a parental school for incorrigibles.¹

The school district of Rochester, according to the report of the superintendent for 1911-1912-1913, was recognizing through special classes three types of pupils who presented special needs.² The first group was composed of pupils who were lacking in natural ability to do the work of the grade; these pupils were placed in special classes if they were behind their grade three or more years. The second group was composed of pupils who were unable to do the work of their grade because of language handicaps; special classes were established to care for the needs of these children. The third group was made up of those children who were retarded on account of late entrance to school, frequent change from one school to another, and other similar causes; coaching classes were organized for this third group of children.³

An age-grade table prepared for the elementary schools of St. Louis in 1898 revealed the fact that 74 per cent of the children in the fifth grade were above normal age for that grade.⁴ The superintendent explained the condition by stating that the fifth grade received its children handicapped by retardation in previous grades. He declared that the most effective remedy for retardation was in the improvement of teaching; teachers had to be on the alert to discover pupils who needed special help and give them the help that was needed.⁵ The superintendent favored individual promotions by which means pupils who were able to do the work of the next grade were not retarded because of waiting for the promotion of an entire group or class.⁶ The superintendent

¹Ibid.

²Fifty-sixth Report of the Board of Education of the City of Rochester, pp. 96-102. Rochester: Board of Education, 1913.

³Ibid., p. 102.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, pp. 97-98. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1899.

⁵Ibid., pp. 113-16.

⁶Ibid., pp. 106-7.

was of the opinion that the ungraded room could be modified in many ways.¹ When there were not sufficient retarded pupils in a building to establish an ungraded room, the backward children could be sent to a strong teacher for special attention. Another modification the superintendent considered possible was to have a room open for an hour after school to which the backward pupils could be sent for the help needed.² In 1908 the board of education established especially planned schools for the education of sub-normal children.³ Two purposes were in mind when the schools were established: (1) to give special training to subnormal children and (2) to relieve the normal children of the retarding influence of the presence of the subnormal children.⁴ By 1914 the number of children in the special schools was four hundred, and it was estimated that there were at least six hundred more who should have been cared for. To handle adequately the operation of special classes, the superintendent made two recommendations which were adopted, namely: (1) that the board of education create the position of Director of the Psycho-Educational Clinic and (2) that this officer should direct the work of the Psycho-Educational Clinic, examine and report on cases of abnormal children, have supervision of special schools for individual instruction, and instruct teachers in methods of teaching special classes.⁵ In the report for 1917 the superintendent recommended the following measures having to do with the education of exceptional children: (1) The establishment of from one hundred to one hundred and twenty-five ungraded classes for the instruction of mentally or educationally retarded children who were not feeble-minded. (2) Each school should be required to report each year for examination by the clinic at least one-half of one per cent of its enrolment as candidates for the special schools for the mentally defective. (3) Children who were found to be feeble-minded were to be sent to the special school. (4) Speech correction work should be begun on an adequate scale.⁶

The superintendent of San Francisco in the report for 1906-1907 recommended that ten ungraded classes be established for the education of retarded children.⁷ The retarded children were

¹Ibid., p. 116.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 157-58, 1914.

⁴Ibid., p. 158.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., pp. 191-92, 1917.

⁷Report of Superintendent of Schools and Board of Education, p. 18. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1907.

to attend the special classes until they were able to rejoin their grades.¹ The superintendent, in the report for 1911, commented on the successful manner in which these ten classes had functioned.² The report for 1926 listed the special classes then in operation in the city,³ which consisted of a school for children of defective hearing, schools for sight saving, a school for crippled children, open air classes, corrective classes, hospital classes, ungraded school for children of lower mentality, prevocational schools for boys, detention house class, and the disciplinary school for special cases.⁴ In addition to the schools and classes mentioned, there were ungraded or opportunity classes in the regular schools where children were given individual teaching in small groups, and also speech improvement classes for children who had speech defects.⁵

The special classes in the schools of Boston increased from twelve in 1912 to sixty-three in 1917. Boston had in 1917 three classes for children with defective eyesight, thirty-seven classes for stammerers, one class for tubercular children, one disciplinary class, thirty-two classes for children who were learning to speak English.⁶ In addition to the special classes mentioned, ten prevocational centers had been established to provide not only for boys who were truant but also for boys who had strong motor tendencies.⁷ There were also twelve prevocational centers provided for girls who had strong motor tendencies.⁸

Fact Finding as a Basis for Determining Policies

The problems connected with retardation and the adaptation of instructional materials to the varying needs of individual pupils were potent influences in the development of fact-finding studies in education. Before the needs of individual pupils could be met, it was necessary to determine the capacities of the pupils. If the problems of retardation were to be solved, it was essential to determine as accurately as possible just what was causing each

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 53, 1911.

³Ibid., p. 5, 1926.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools,
p. 8. Boston: Board of Education, 1917.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid.

individual pupil to be retarded. After determining the capacities of the pupils and the probable causes of their retardation, the next step was the adaptation of the course of study to suit the manifested needs.

The steady increase in the cost of conducting the schools required that all needless expenditures be eliminated. Fact-finding methods were able to determine what phases and departments of the educational program were responsible for the increase in costs. When the phases or departments of the school system causing the increase in costs were identified, the next step was to determine whether these costs could be reduced without impairing the efficiency of the school system. The cost of school buildings and the adaptability of the buildings to the purposes for which they were intended were problems requiring careful study. A school building, if it were to serve to its fullest extent the purposes for which it had been erected, had to be planned to house the program around which the school organization was developed. Constant study and experimentation with the school curriculum necessitated constant study and experimentation in building planning.

Fact finding and experimentation also found many challenges in the tasks connected with record making and keeping. The best types of records to be kept, as well as the kinds of information to be included, were problems for the fact-finding department. The controlling criterion in the case of records was the collecting of the facts and figures which could be adequately interpreted to the public or to the teachers of the school system.

The organization of fact-finding or research bureaus in city school systems is a development of about the last twenty years; Baltimore is given credit for having established the first such bureau in 1912.¹ The activities and findings of the research bureaus have had a marked influence on the policies of the superintendents of schools. The materials presented in the following paragraphs show some of the effects and results of this relatively new department in city school systems.

The superintendent of the schools of Washington in the report for 1915-1916 stated that there was great need for research in the schools of Washington.² The administration of the school system required facts concerning business transactions, construction problems, and educational issues, and the record system must

¹H. B. Chapman, Organized Research in Education, p. 10. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1927.

²Report of the Board of Education to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, p. 39. Washington: Board of Education, 1916.

be planned with a view to making available the facts needed.¹ The superintendent felt that the office of finance and accounts was fairly well organized to do its part in the work in research, and that a similar organization was needed for handling the records which pertained to instruction.² The educational records should make possible studies of the adjustment of the educational load to the pupil, of the relation of school work to life careers, of all peculiar children, and of educational procedure and accomplishment.³ The testing and research could be started in a very limited way, but must be developed later into a unit in the headquarters organization.⁴

The report of the superintendent for 1922-1923 discussed a controversy which had developed in the city over the use of tests and their results.⁵ Parent teacher associations had contributed funds to help defray the expenses of the testing program and some individuals and organizations had objected to this means of raising money and of the use of tests.⁶ The board of education fixed a date on which both sides were to have a hearing. As a result of the hearing, the board of education approved everything that had been done and went on record as being favorable to an extension of the program.⁷ This approval meant the endorsement of the establishment of special schools for rapid and slow pupils and for rapid promotion. It also meant the use of test results as a factor in determining the basis for classification in elementary and junior high schools and at the same time approval of the policy of training the normal school students in the theory and practice of educational measurements.⁸ The two principals who had, up to this time, been carrying on the testing work in the schools were promoted to the rank of assistant superintendents in charge of educational research.⁹

The superintendent of Baltimore in the report for 1912 stated that one of the principals had been available for research work during the year and that he had made a study of the arithmetic abilities of the children in the elementary schools.¹⁰ The survey

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., pp. 30-31, 1923.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 31.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Report of the Board of School Commissioners, p. 75.
Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1912.

report issued in 1921 recommended that the bureau of research and statistics be expanded into a bureau of research, measurements, and statistics.¹ Previous to the survey this bureau had devoted itself chiefly to statistical data on attendance, withdrawal from school, promotion and progress of school children. One of the first studies undertaken by the enlarged bureau was that of the better classification of pupils, and in one such project, out of 3,285 pupils examined and reclassified, over 307 had gained from a half year to more than a year by extra promotion and the prevention of failure.²

The report for 1925 indicated that the bureau of research was continuing in its program of reclassification.³ During the 1925-1926 school term the bureau gave tests in seventy-seven schools to 50,722 pupils,⁴ and remedial instruction based on the results of the tests was planned after the testing. Through the testing of the bureau, the reorganization of classes, and the remedial instruction, a distinct improvement had been made in classroom instruction.

Under the provisions of law passed by the Legislature of Oregon in 1923 the board of education in Portland established a bureau of research and guidance in January, 1925.⁵ In the report for 1925-1926 the superintendent stated that the bureau had made investigations to determine the difficulties which the different subjects in the course of study presented and had proposed remedies to solve the difficulties discovered.⁶ During the school term of 1926-1927 the bureau of research and guidance was concerned largely with the problems of locating pupil difficulties.⁷ The objective of the department, according to the superintendent, had been the placing of the children, as rapidly as possible, where they could do the work.⁸

The bureau of research and efficiency of the schools of Kansas City was organized in June, 1914.⁹ The purpose of the

¹Ibid., p. 30, 1923.

²Ibid., p. 36, 1921.

³Ibid., pp. 48-51, 1925.

⁴Ibid., p. 16, 1925-26.

⁵Fifty-third Annual Report. School District No. 1. Multnomah County, Including the City of Portland, p. 14. Portland: Board of Education, 1926.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 15, 1927.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Report of the Superintendent of the Kansas City Schools, pp. 49-50. Kansas City: Board of Education, 1914.

bureau was to assist in discovering better methods in administering and supervising the schools and in teaching the subjects of the school curriculum.¹ The specific functions of the bureau were listed in the following order: (1) to measure and tabulate the work that was then being done in the schools; (2) to study the work of similar bureaus in other cities and bring to Kansas City the best conclusions of those bureaus; (3) to coöperate in the investigation of any problem that might confront the board of education, the superintendent, the supervisors, the principals, the teachers, or the community; (4) to tabulate and analyze all statistical reports; (5) to study methods of reducing waste in the school system; (6) to study with the principals and teachers plans for reducing elimination, non-promotions, and failures of pupils.²

In the report for 1921-1927 the superintendent stated that the bureau of research and efficiency had undertaken: (1) to survey the results in the fundamental school subjects and to determine city norms, averages, and standards; (2) to guide teachers in their programs of diagnostic testing to discover the weak and strong points in their class and in individual pupils; (3) to interpret tests and test results for teachers; (4) to determine the mental ability of pupils by means of intelligence tests; (5) to assist and counsel with teachers and principals in classifying pupils into homogeneous groups and in making special promotions; (6) to help to reclassify pupils on the basis of achievement and intelligence tests; (7) to use intelligence tests, especially individual tests in selecting pupils for opportunity schools and limited or ungraded classes; and (8) to assist teachers to use test results in educational and vocational guidance of pupils.³

A department of educational research for the schools of Detroit was organized in 1914, and the general program of work proposed for the department was outlined in the report of the superintendent.⁴ Four phases of work were suggested as being the types to be taken up, namely, (1) research, (2) standardization, (3) statistics, (4) library and reference service.⁵ In 1923 the work of the department of instructional research was summarized as follows: (1) construction of a scheme of achievement and growth ratings to aid in the interpretation of test results; (2) the

¹Ibid., p. 49.

²Ibid., pp. 49-50.

³Ibid., pp. 16-17, 1927.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 81. Detroit: Board of Education, 1914.

⁵Ibid., p. 82.

significance of rate and quality in the measurement of ability in English Composition; (3) the change during four years in class achievement in the common branches as measured by standard tests; (4) the effect of kindergarten attendance and of age at entrance upon the rate of subsequent progress; (5) educational progress in relation to XYZ groupings; (6) study of children's curves based upon their test records for four years.¹ The department had also provided more than a million standard tests, organized and helped to interpret the resulting data, and cooperated with supervisors and principals in a large number of special cases.²

The division of reference and research of the schools of Cleveland was established in 1916.³ The duties of this department as contemplated when it was established were threefold: (1) the standardization of educational supplies and equipment for all schools and each type of school; (2) the clearance of all requests for the erection of buildings and of building changes; (3) the supervision of the system of reports and the determination of the forms of reports. The collection and summarization of the reports during each summer vacation were duties of this department. It also studied reports to determine the percentage of promotion and non-promotion, repetition, retardation, and elimination, and assumed responsibility for conducting tests to compare the efficiency of one type of school with another and the effectiveness of instruction in one subject with another, and for scoring of papers and tabulating results.⁴ In the report for 1917 the superintendent stated that the bureau of research and standards was living well up to the promises made for it when it was established.⁵ Committees on standards had been named for arithmetic, geography, history, penmanship, reading and English, spelling, and blank forms.⁶

The department of standards, measurements, and statistics for the schools of Chicago was established in 1917.⁷ The functions of the department were the following: (1) The department was expected to study problems in economy of organization and school administration and to assist in providing ways and means

¹Ibid., p. 20, 1923.

²Ibid.

³Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, pp. 37-38. Cleveland: Board of Education, 1916.

⁴Ibid., p. 38.

⁵Ibid., p. 71, 1917.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 43-45. Chicago: Board of Education, 1918.

of bringing the classroom work to a standard of higher efficiency.

(2) It was the duty of the department to institute investigations which would throw light on the causes of retardation of pupils and to assist in the classification and readjustment of school conditions to meet the needs of the varied types of children.

(3) Another duty of the department was to provide comparative estimates of the educational value of studies pursued by the pupils and to recommend the adjustment of time schedules and programs with relation to the same. (4) The department was expected

to make a careful study of report and statistical forms that were in use in the public school system, and to provide for such revisions as would correct defects, give intelligent statements of conditions, and provide data that would be of interest to the public. (5) The department collected and abstracted reports re-

garding the organization, management, and operation of the systems of school in other cities, home and foreign, as an aid to the superintendent in determining the educational policies of Chicago. (6) The department was to provide rational means for testing and

measuring the work in the various grades of the schools. (7) The best educational ideas were to be collected and distributed to the members of the educational division.¹

Denver organized a department of measurements and standards in 1917. The superintendent in the report for 1917-1918 stated the purposes of the organization of the new department.² He felt that it was necessary for a school system to be equipped to carry on investigations of its accomplishments in order to use the results for guidance in many sorts of decisions and actions.³ In the report for the years 1923-1927 the superintendent discussed the work of the bureau of measurements and standards for the four years covered by the report. The chief function of the department was research in both the administrative and instructional fields.⁴ In the fields of administration the activities dealt chiefly with the educational specifications of buildings, cost studies, and the preparation of the budget. Research had also been carried on with respect to the best design for the buildings and the best types of furniture to be used. The building needs for the succeeding six years were determined largely by this department. In the field of instructional research over one hundred and twenty tests were compiled under the direction of the department, and it also

¹Ibid., pp. 44-45.

²Annual Report of the Public Schools, p. 22. Denver: Board of Education, 1918.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 60, 1927.

conducted controlled experiments in the schools.¹

Curriculum Revision

Present day curriculum construction in the public schools of American cities is an undertaking differing markedly from course of study making as practiced by the superintendents in the early days of the office. The courses of study of the early days gave a bare outline of the materials to be covered in each grade of the school system. As a general rule, the materials were to be found in adopted textbooks and the grade limits of the materials were set up by specific reference to pages in the textbooks. The curriculum specified not only the materials to be taught but also the methods and organization to be used in teaching the materials. The old courses of study were, for the most part, constructed by the superintendent of schools. Modern curriculum construction and revision, on the contrary, is a continuous undertaking with the classroom teachers, principals, supervisory staff, directors of research, and subject matter and methods specialists having a prominent share in the activities involved. The old course of study was concerned with the learning of facts; the modern curriculum is concerned with the development of integrated individuals through the acquisition of correct habits, attitudes, understandings and skills.

Many factors have contributed to this changed point of view and changed technique in the preparation of the curriculum. A larger number of pupils is being educated in the public schools. The individual differences of the pupils are being recognized and considered in the development of technique and curriculum materials. The demands of the economic and social forces have added a greater number of subjects to the curriculum. But perhaps the most significant factor in the change has been the development of the programs of fact finding by bureaus of research in the public school systems of the cities. These bureaus were established with the primary purpose of eliminating waste in education through a standardization of administrative and instructional practices, but the work of these bureaus has permeated to every activity connected with the operation of a system of schools. Research has helped to discover pupil needs and difficulties and the best methods of meeting and overcoming these needs and difficulties. It has helped to discover the limitations of individual pupils and has developed the spirit of experimentation. Administrative research has exposed the pitiful shortcomings of some of the

¹Ibid., p. 61.

previously conceived best methods of procedure and stimulated the attitude of inquiry and doubt, the constant need for change and improvement, and the development of an attitude of open-mindedness by those responsible for the schools.

One of the most widely known programs of curriculum construction and revision is that developed in the schools of Denver. The annual reports of the schools show the development of this program. In the report for 1917-1918 the superintendent referred to the fact that the curriculum had been revised during the preceding year.¹ More than three hundred grade teachers had worked on curriculum committees throughout the year, and this work formed the core of the subsequent course of study. During the spring and early summer the course was put into final shape by the principals and directors.²

The report of the superintendent for 1922-1923 announced that committees had been appointed for the revision of the curriculum.³ The chairmen of the committees having in charge the selection and organization of subject matter were all teachers and the chairmen of the reviewing committees were members of the supervisory staff. An experimental school had been established, and in this school experimentation in methods and curriculum content were being conducted.⁴ A supervision council composed of teachers and supervisors had been organized, to meet bi-weekly for the discussion of problems relating to instruction and the curriculum. Committees had been appointed to keep the staff informed as to the best magazine articles and books dealing with the work of the teacher. The faculties of the various schools tended to become centers for the discussion of problems relating to teaching and to the curriculum.⁵ The superintendent was of the opinion that the community could afford to wait two or three years for results of the type which were expected to follow the sort of study described. The method employed was intended to produce a much richer outcome than an arbitrary method which would crush out the initiative and resourcefulness of the teachers.⁶

In June, 1923, the board of education adopted a curriculum revision program designed to become a permanent agency for curricu-

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education for the City of Denver, p. 21. Denver: Board of Education, 1918.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 20-22, 1922-23.

⁴Ibid., p. 21.

⁵Ibid., p. 22.

⁶Ibid.

lum revision in the schools.¹ The superintendent described the program under five heads: (1) The board of education appropriated \$31,500 for the first and \$25,000 for the second year. At the end of two years a permanent department was established with an annual budget for its exclusive use. (2) Provision was made for relieving teachers who were serving on committees from classroom duties, and more than three thousand days of teacher time were thus made available annually. (3) Plans were made for bringing well known specialists to Denver to hold discussions with committees. (4) Arrangements were made with the University of Colorado and the State Teachers College at Greeley for part-time service work. When the permanent curriculum department was established in 1925, a full-time director was employed. (5) A special clerical staff was employed and headquarters for the department were set up in the administration building of the public schools.²

The principles underlying the curriculum revision program, according to the superintendent, were: (1) Curriculum revision must be a continuous process if the courses of study were to embody the latest findings of educational research and best experience. (2) Teachers' participation in the revision was essential if the curriculum was to be effectually applied in the classrooms. (3) The services of specialists were essential if the work was to have the benefit of the best and latest research experience and thinking. (4) If the schools were to serve the community in the best possible manner, the curriculum revision had to be continuous and the direction had to come from the office of the superintendent of schools. An assistant superintendent had been in general charge of the curriculum revision in Denver since its inception in 1922.³

The superintendent of Baltimore in the report for 1929 discussed the establishment of curriculum study centers in that city.⁴ The general functions of the centers according to the report, were threefold: (1) The centers provided opportunities for the application of progressive principles of education. (2) The centers served as tryout agencies for curriculum materials and methods. (3) In the primary field the centers served as laboratories in which courses of study adapted to mental abilities might be definitely worked out. In the primary centers a beginning was made in the development of units of work to be used in each of the primary grades, and valuable material for use in curriculum

¹Ibid., pp. 17-24, 1923-27.

²Ibid., pp. 17-18.

³Ibid., p. 18.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners, pp. 49-51. Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1929.

revision in those grades was developed.¹ In the intermediate centers most of the effort was spent on the development of units of work, which were frequently tried out with children of different abilities. This procedure helped to develop variations in methods to suit different levels of ability.²

The director of the schools of Cleveland in the report for 1901 called the attention of the superintendent of schools to the course of study in use.³ The director stated that the effect of the course on the physical and mental condition of the pupils was attracting the attention of educators, physicians, and all other people familiar with school affairs in all parts of the country.⁴ The superintendent in the report for the same year attempted to explain the condition mentioned by the director. His explanation furnished some interesting facts on course of study construction in Cleveland.

The course of study then in use in the schools had been written by the superintendent in 1896. For the three years previous to 1896 the course of study in use was one that had been prepared by another superintendent. For the ten years previous to 1893 the course of study in use had been prepared by still another superintendent. Previous to 1883 the course of study in use had been prepared by the first superintendent of schools, who had served in that capacity for a period of fourteen years.⁵ The most interesting fact in connection with all of the revisions mentioned was that, in every case, the work had been done by the superintendent of schools. The issue involved in the question raised by the director, centered, in the opinion of the superintendent, about the fact as to whether the course of study should be liberal or conservative.⁶ By a conservative course of study was meant one that insisted that little children should confine their efforts to learning the practical subjects such as reading, spelling, writing, and arithmetic, and should not attempt to learn about their physical environment until they were older.⁷ By a liberal course of study was meant a course so designed that it was not necessary for the child to be confined to any one type of work for a long period of time. The more formal subjects were

¹Ibid., pp. 49-50.

²Ibid., p. 50.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 32-33.

Cleveland: Board of Education, 1901.

⁴Ibid., p. 32.

⁵Ibid., pp. 68-70.

⁶Ibid., pp. 68-69.

⁷Ibid., p. 70.

broken by attention to the natural sciences and good literature. Such a program, it was argued, would give the child more happiness and he would learn more than under the more rigid procedure.¹ The superintendent did not hesitate to say, in unmistakable language, that he was an advocate of the liberal type of course of study.

In the report for 1917-1918 the superintendent of Cleveland stated that, in progressive school systems, the course of study was undergoing constant revision.² During the previous year all of the principal subjects of the curriculum had been under constant and critical study by committees representing different grades and departments and many of the results of these studies had been put into operation in the schools immediately.³ The report of the superintendent for 1927-1928 indicated that, within that year, nine elementary schools had been set aside for specialized work looking toward curriculum reconstruction.⁴

The division of curriculum research of the schools of Detroit was organized in 1929.⁵ The purpose of the division, according to the report of the superintendent, was fourfold: (1) The division was to assist the members of the staff in evaluating methods used, in making use of research studies in Detroit and elsewhere, and in gathering and interpreting material of a research nature. (2) The division was to assist in coördinating and unifying the work of the various departments in building courses of study. (3) It was to carry on studies of a general nature. (4) It was to develop better research procedures and to assist in facilitating their use.

According to the report of the superintendent of Minneapolis for 1891-1892, the course of study was revised in 1891.⁶ Previous to the revision, the course was cumbersome and severe. A condition which had been intensified by the introduction of new materials from time to time without eliminating any of the old. The report of the superintendent for 1908 stated that in reviewing the course of study suggestions were always asked from teachers and principals. These suggestions, he said, varied so widely that they were difficult to use, but he felt that much good came from having them submitted. The variance in opinions was corrected in

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 22-23, 1917-18.

³Ibid., p. 22.

⁴Ibid., pp. 10-12, 1927-28.

⁵Annual Report of the Detroit Public Schools, p. 27.
Detroit: Board of Education, 1929.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 8-9.
Minneapolis: Board of Education, 1892.

the procedure set up for the revision of the course of study in 1910-1911. A committee of twenty principals was appointed to make the first draft of the revision.¹ An invitation to submit suggestions was extended to all principals and teachers and to the public in general. After the first draft was completed, meetings with teachers were held and they were again invited to make suggestions. The final report was submitted to the superintendent in March, 1912. The superintendent and his assistants then made such changes as seemed necessary and the course was put into use at the opening of the school term in 1912-1913. A year's trial showed the need for some changes, which were made by the superintendent and his staff during the summer.² The procedure seems to be a middle ground between an imposed and a coöperative course of study. The report of the superintendent for 1926-1927 discussed the demonstration lessons which had been conducted in the schools during the year as a part of the curriculum study program, and which were given, for the most part, in one school organized for the purpose.³

The superintendent of New York in the report for 1925 stated that the general course of study for the elementary schools and the syllabi in several subjects should be studied carefully in the light of modern educational thought.⁴ He was of the opinion that while progress had been made in classifying pupils according to ability, the course of study and standards of attainment had not been modified to meet the abilities of the slow pupils.⁵

The general committee for the revision of the course of study in the schools of New York was appointed in June, 1925.⁶ The duties assigned to the general committee were to furnish the motive power, organize the plans of campaign, appoint and direct the sub-committees, and otherwise furnish expert advice and suggestions to those actually engaged in the work of curriculum reconstruction.⁷ Nineteen subject committees were appointed, which, for the most part, were made up of a principal as chairman, a vice-principal, and three teachers. Each committee was given the privilege of increasing its membership by adding persons who would meet the approval of the general committee. Each committee

¹Ibid., pp. 44-45, 1911.

²Ibid., pp. 63-64, 1914.

³Ibid., pp. 36-37, 1926-27.

⁴Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, pp. 22-23. New York: Board of Education, 1925.

⁵Ibid., p. 22.

⁶Ibid., pp. 124-27, 1926.

⁷Ibid., p. 124.

was expected to produce a course of study and syllabus of minimum essentials adapted to normal progress pupils. A special committee for bright and slow pupils studied the needs of deviate children and prepared modified or enriched courses adapted to the needs of the varying abilities.¹ The course of study revision was proceeding in a most satisfactory manner in 1928, according to the report of the superintendent for that year. One course of study was in use, four would be ready for use at the beginning of the 1928-1929 term, and seven were unfinished.²

In 1924 subject and reference committees were appointed to begin the revision of the curriculum of the Seattle schools.³ The first year was devoted to a consideration of objectives and the collection of materials from the classrooms. The superintendent felt that the work of revision would move forward slowly and only as fast as the separate steps permitted. Some of the work was first tried out in classrooms before being placed in the curriculum.⁴ To give the teachers the opportunity of seeing the new courses of study in operation, the superintendent organized one of the elementary schools as a demonstration school in 1926.⁵ Demonstrations were scheduled in advance and the attendance was limited; principals of schools found the demonstration schools valuable as a means of giving help to the teachers who were in greatest need of the help.⁶

Courses of study making was an ever-present problem of school systems, if the statement of the superintendent of Salt Lake City in the report for 1928-1929 is to be accepted.⁷ The policy of Salt Lake City was to revise the course in one or two subjects each year. For the 1928-1929 school term committees had been appointed to revise the courses in nature study, social science, health education, and junior and senior high school English.⁸ The committees made a careful study of the best materials to be found on the subjects and the needs and conditions of the local system. After the studies had been completed they were carefully checked by the superintendent and his staff and then

¹Ibid., p. 126.

²Ibid., p. 36, 1928.

³Triennial Report of the Public Schools, pp. 50-58.
Seattle: Board of Directors, 1927.

⁴Ibid., pp. 57-58.

⁵Ibid., p. 58.

⁶Ibid., p. 59.

⁷Thirty-ninth Annual Report of the Public Schools of Salt Lake City, p. 14. Salt Lake City: Board of Education, 1929.

⁸Ibid.

put into practice in the schools. The superintendent felt that the plan was both effective and economical.¹

The board of education in Portland approved the appointment of committees on courses of study and textbooks in 1925.² The committees were to make studies of textbooks and to revise the courses of study for both the elementary and high schools. The superintendent planned to use the partially revised courses during the next school year in order to try them out and to complete the revision.³

In the report for 1927 the superintendent stated that several committees had worked on courses of study for both elementary and high schools.⁴ The board of education had, during the year, released teachers and principals from their regular work to serve on the revision committees. The work was moving along rapidly and the superintendent felt that the revised course could be ready in its entirety by the beginning of the next school term, or in September, 1927. He recommended that action be taken setting aside one of the elementary schools as a demonstration center, and thought the school should be organized on the platoon plan since that plan of organization was so widely in use in Portland.⁵

The superintendent of San Francisco in the report for 1901 expressed the conviction that the elementary course of study was overburdened.⁶ He felt that the doctrine of study without hard mental labor, which was the principle on which the kindergarten had been founded, had permeated to the grammar schools.⁷ In a summary of the problems considered in the schools in the two years from 1924-1926, the superintendent mentioned, under "course of study," the following activities: (1) Progress had been made in the reorganization of the course of study in elementary schools and junior high school. (2) Committees had been steadily at work upon the revision of the high-school courses of study.⁸

¹Ibid.

²Fifty-third Annual Report. School District No. 1. Multnomah County, Oregon Including the City of Portland, pp. 16-17. Portland: Board of Education, 1926.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Annual Report. School District No. 1. Multnomah County, Oregon Including the City of Portland, p. 16. Portland: Board of Education, 1927.

⁶Annual Report of the Public Schools of the City and County of San Francisco, p. 36. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1901.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., p. 6, 1926.

During the school term of 1926-1927 the superintendent selected committees of teachers to work on the problems of standards for five subjects in the seventh and eighth grades.¹ These committees prepared lessons to be submitted as types for the constructive criticism of the teachers who were to apply the plans in their daily teaching. At the end of three weeks' trial the teachers returned to report on the trials. The procedure had resulted in twenty group conferences and the presentation of sixty different type lessons.²

Realizing that curriculum revision must be a continuous program, the curriculum department of the schools of San Francisco was organized in 1926.³ The department was headed by a deputy superintendent assisted by the director of educational research and service and with a member of the staff of Stanford University as curriculum consultant.⁴ The courses were constructed by subject committees of teachers and reviewed by principals and supervisory or administrative heads appointed by the curriculum department.

At the close of the 1912-1913 school term the superintendent of the schools of St. Louis appointed a number of committees which were expected to make a revision of the courses of study.⁵ The committees included a general committee on the purpose and scope of the course of study and fifty sub-committees on the content of the course. The personnel of the committee on the purpose and scope of the course included the superintendent of schools, the assistant superintendents of schools, the principal of the Harris Teachers College and twelve teachers and supervisors. The duty of the general committee was to outline in a comprehensive way the entire field of the work, apportion the details of the sub-committees, define the relationship of the committees to each other and determine the method of procedure to be used with the work. The general committee began its task by attempting to define the aim and scope of education in modern life. The committee also undertook to determine the place and function of the public school in realizing the aim. It was hoped that this could be done by pointing out what the school should attempt to do, what it should not attempt to do and to what extent the school should cooperate with other agencies such as the home, the church, the library, and the playground. The special committee finally

¹Ibid., p. 19, 1927.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Sixtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of St. Louis, pp. 299-321. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1914.

formulated the following generalization: "Given a certain amount and kind of subject matter to be taught in a specified time, required to find the best apportionment, gradation and arrangement of this subject matter to accomplish the highest results."¹

The generalization reached by the special committee was turned over to the sub-committees which were expected to develop courses of study for the several school subjects. The sub-committees were also directed to suggest the most suitable methods of treating the contents of the courses of study in order that successful instruction might result. The sub-committees were enjoined that they should be guided by the principles of teaching rather than by the principles of the broader and more difficult science of education.

In the report of the schools of St. Louis for 1914-1915 several of the supervisors made comments to the effect that the work of the schools was much more effective and interesting because of the revisions of the courses of study.² There is no further evidence, in the reports, that the sub-committees made any determined and continuous efforts to conclude the tasks assigned them. The failure of the sub-committees to produce any great amount of completed work may, it would seem, be attributed to the vague, indefinite, and philosophical character of the report of the general committee.

During the school year 1924-1925 the superintendent of schools of St. Louis upon inquiry, discovered that, in the opinion of the principals, the outstanding need of the public school system was an intense and complete revision of the course of study.³ The first undertaking in the task of curriculum construction was the setting up of a tentative program. The fundamental principles embodied were as follows: (1) One of the first tasks in constructing a curriculum is to set up aims and objectives of the school in the community. (2) It is sound pedagogy to have a common continuous program of progressive procedure in each field of instruction running from the kindergarten through all divisions of the school system. (3) Use as many people connected with the St. Louis schools as is possible, the ideal being to have everyone working at some particular job with reference to the curriculum. (4) Jobs or units of curriculum construction will finally be broken up into small specific pieces. (5) Curriculum experiments and work carried on in other centers should be

¹Ibid., pp. 300-307.

²Ibid., pp. 84-86, 1914-15.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 38.

carefully investigated and practical results made available for local use. (6) Effort should be made to incorporate the most advanced educational thought and method in all phases of the work. (7) Colleges of education, graduate students, and school systems over the country should be interested in various problems relating to the tasks of curriculum construction in the St. Louis schools.¹

Twelve committees, ranging in size from three to nine members, were appointed for the various subjects or division of the school system. Sub-committees in each of the subjects were appointed, totaling approximately two hundred and fifty committees.² In making up the committees it was decided that the principals should be responsible for the administration of the program, the teachers were to have the responsibility for the productive side of the work, and the teachers, principals, and supervisors were to be responsible for the installation of the curriculum into the schools.³

In the summer of 1926 forty-seven curriculum bulletins were published under the authority of the board of education of St. Louis.⁴ These bulletins represented complete reports of one hundred forty-seven committees of teachers who had worked during the preceding year on the revision of the curriculum. In July, 1926, the board of education authorized the superintendent of schools to make trial use of the courses. After this authorization had been granted the superintendent asked the teachers to cooperate in a careful study of the bulletins. As a result of this request more than two thousand reports were considered. The superintendent directed the principals to substitute the new courses for those then in use and to make such experiments with them as conditions would permit.⁵

Summary

This chapter has pointed out some of the factors and developments which added materially to the duties and responsibilities of superintendents of schools. The course of study which was an early obligation of superintendents continued as an ever-present problem. Actual use of the course, as revised at any one time, revealed difficulties and contingencies not anticipated when

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 39.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., pp. 36-37, 1927.

⁵Ibid., p. 37.

the revisions were made. The problems incident to the establishment of a graded system of schools were not solved when the first course of study was adopted. Experience indicated that the time allowed for the completion of the work of the elementary schools was too long or too brief. In either case a readjustment of the course of study was necessary. The adjustment was initiated, directed and approved by the superintendents of schools.

New subjects were added to the curriculum of the public schools as time went on. In some cases the subjects were added because of the efforts of the superintendent, in other instances the insistence on the inclusion of subjects came from groups not connected with the staff of the schools. It will never be known, however, how much of the outside insistence was directed and inspired by the activity of the superintendent. When the new subjects were added, it was necessary to revise the course of study, readjust the time allotments, and make other provisions for including the new subject in the curriculum. The detailed plans for the inclusion were developed or directed by the superintendents of schools. After the subjects had become a part of the school curriculum, the superintendent was responsible for all of the supervision necessary to make the curriculum unified.

The enactment of compulsory school attendance laws brought a group of children into the schools who either had not been attending at all or who had attended very irregularly. The admission of these children brought several problems to the superintendent. The school accommodations were not, in all cities, adequate to house the children who were forced to attend. Many of the children were retarded and consequently over-age for their grade. The large and over-age children could not be placed in grades with young or normal progress pupils. Special rooms had to be provided and an adaptation of the course of study had to be made. Frequently the children forced into school by the enactment of compulsory school attendance laws were actual or potential criminals. Detention and reform schools were established to care for children of this type.

A large number of physical and mental deviates entered school when the laws compelled all children between certain ages to attend. If these children were not to become adult charges of society, it was necessary to assist them to develop their physical and mental capacities to the fullest extent possible. In many cases this development could not be made in the existing schools organized and operated for normal children. It then became the duty of the superintendent of schools to develop and administer schools for deviate children.

As city school systems grew in size and complexity the costs of operating them mounted. The mounting costs stimulated careful study of the organization and operation of schools. If the studies were to be made intelligently and conclusively it was necessary to collect, analyze, and evaluate a large number of facts that dealt with the organization, operation, and administration of schools. The array of facts needed could not, for lack of time, be collected and analyzed by the existing administrative organization. Fact-finding or research organizations were established on the recommendation of the superintendent and were planned and directed by that officer. The findings of these organizations were invaluable to superintendents in establishing policies and making recommendations to the boards of education. Superintendents were now able to make decisions based on findings rather than on opinion.

The discoveries of the research bureau in connection with the manner in which children learn were largely responsible for the conviction that the curriculum of the schools needs continuous revision and experimentation, if the schools are to function as efficiently and completely as they should. Obviously the persons best qualified to make the revisions and experiments are the teachers who are constantly working with children in the classrooms. On the recommendation of superintendents, organizations responsible for constant curriculum revision were set up in a number of city school systems. The work of these organizations is directed by the superintendent of schools or by an assistant designated by the superintendent.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SUPERINTENDENT'S RESPONSIBILITIES FOR BUILDING AND FINANCE PROGRAMS

Early School Plants Inadequate

The earliest city schools were, for the most part, housed in buildings which were not the property of the school district. There is abundant evidence that the rented rooms which were used for school purposes were generally poorly adapted to the use which was made of them.

In the report for 1878 the superintendent of schools of Boston mentioned the fact that the early primary schools of that city were kept in the residences of the teachers.¹ The school report of Cincinnati for 1833 discussed the plans which had been made looking toward the acquisition of a public school plant.² The charter of Cincinnati as amended in 1827 provided that the city council was to purchase a suitable lot of land in each district of the city and to erect a suitable school building on the land within two years.³ In the meantime the council was required to rent such buildings as were necessary to accommodate the schools.⁴ The board of education report suggested that it might be well to construct one building immediately in order that its plan might be tried out before the remaining buildings were erected.⁵

The report of the school commissioners of Milwaukee for 1848 devoted considerable space to the consideration of the lack of proper school buildings.⁶ The city council had been authorized to borrow money and erect school buildings.⁷ The board of school

¹Annual School Report, p. 36. Boston: School Committee, 1878.

²Report of Common Schools, pp. 6-12. Cincinnati: School Committee, 1833.

³Ibid., p. 12.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Second Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners of the City of Milwaukee, pp. 6-7. Milwaukee: School Commissioners, 1848.

⁷Ibid., p. 6.

commissioners was fearful lest all of the voted funds would be used in acquiring sites, which would mean that the buildings would not be provided.¹ The report commented on the inadequacy of the rented quarters which were then in use for school purposes. Each pupil should have had 150 cubic feet of air space, while the space in the rented quarters varied from twenty-nine to seventh-three cubic feet per pupil.²

The report of San Francisco for 1854, made mention of the fact that the schools, with one exception, were housed in temporary buildings entirely unsuited for school purposes.³ To make matters worse the city council had made no provision for erecting new and suitable buildings.⁴

The school report of Philadelphia for 1861 stated that the item for rent of school buildings showed the expenditure of an amount of money equivalent to the interest on \$442,245 for one year at six per cent.⁵ Again in 1863 the rent item was mentioned in the report; this year the amount paid for rent was equal to the interest on \$586,114 at six per cent. The report further asserted that the rented buildings were unsafe, unsanitary, and inconvenient.⁶

According to the report of Chicago for 1877, the board of education of that city was paying an amount equivalent to the interest on \$200,000 at six per cent for the renting of buildings for school use.⁷ The rented rooms were of insufficient size for school purposes and, on account of the consequent reduced enrolment, the board of education was not getting full returns from the teachers of those rooms.⁸ The report for 1891 mentioned the

¹Ibid., p. 7.

²Ibid.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education to the Common Council of San Francisco, pp. 4-5. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1854.

⁴Ibid., p. 5.

⁵Forty-second Annual Report of the Controllers of the Public Schools of the First School District of Pennsylvania Comprising the City of Philadelphia, p. 17. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1861.

⁶Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Controllers of the Public Schools of the First School District of Pennsylvania Comprising the City of Philadelphia, p. 10. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1863.

⁷Twenty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 27-28. Chicago: Board of Education, 1877.

⁸Ibid.

payment of \$37,000 in rent for school accommodations and called attention to the unsatisfactory condition of the rented rooms.¹

The school district of New Haven had urgent need for additional school accommodations in 1861, and to meet the emergency the board of education rented basement rooms in two churches and an abandoned fire house.²

In the report for 1877-1878 the superintendent of the schools of Kansas City gave a brief sketch of the early history of the school system.³ When the schools were authorized in 1867 there was not a public school building in the city. The buildings that could be rented for school purposes were old deserted dwellings, unoccupied storerooms, and damp, gloomy basements in some of the churches.⁴ These rooms were, according to the report, hastily and scantily furnished and the children were huddled into such quarters to receive instruction.⁵

The schools of Louisville and Washington were seriously handicapped for accommodations as a result of the Civil War. A few days after the school term opened in Louisville in 1862 the military authorities ordered the board of education to surrender the school buildings for use as hospitals.⁶ The school authorities appealed to the churches and succeeded in getting the use of the church basements for school purposes, eight of which were used during the year.⁷

The report of Washington for 1862-1863 mentioned the fact that the first district had been seriously handicapped for school-rooms.⁸ The schools were evidently operating in church basements until the churches were taken over by the military authorities for use as hospitals.⁹ In the first district, the female grammar school which occupied a rented room, was deprived of that room

¹Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 16-17. Chicago: Board of Education, 1891.

²Annual Report of the Board of Education of the New Haven City School District, pp. 10-11. New Haven: Board of Education, 1861.

³Seventh Annual Report of the Kansas City Public Schools, pp. 22-23. Kansas City: Board of Education, 1878.

⁴Ibid., p. 22.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 26-27. Louisville: Board of Education, 1862.

⁷Ibid., p. 27.

⁸Annual Report of the Trustees of Public Schools of the City of Washington, p. 8. Washington: Board of Trustees, 1863.

⁹Ibid.

when the building was taken over and made into a surgical museum.¹ An attempt was made to supply a schoolroom by erecting a temporary building, and the president of the United States gave his consent, but the Secretary of War prevented the building from being erected.

The Superintendent's Early Responsibilities with Respect
to the Erection of School Buildings

The first duty of the superintendents in connection with the school plant was to convince boards of education that church basements and unsanitary storerooms were unsatisfactory quarters for schools. The next responsibility was to insist that certain standards and types of buildings were necessary for the operation of a graded system of schools.

In St. Louis it was made the duty of the superintendent of schools to give to the building committee of the board of education, when needed, such information as he might possess on the best plans for school buildings.² In 1857 the superintendent of St. Louis was directed by the board of education to visit the principal cities of the east and to examine carefully their school buildings.³ The superintendent made a report on his visit and some general principles relating to school buildings were agreed upon by the board of education.⁴ Several of the principles adopted had reference to the policy of changing the school plant to meet the needs of the graded school system.⁵

The schoolhouses of St. Louis were to be of ultimate uniform size throughout the city, and in districts where the full size was not then needed, the buildings were to be built in units. Each ultimate school building was to contain twelve rooms with seats for about 700 pupils.⁶ The houses were three stories in height with four rooms on each floor, and each room was to accommodate sixty pupils of the primary grades or fifty-six pupils of the grammar grades.⁷ The St. Louis plan for school buildings was evidently adopted from the plan of the Quincy school erected in Boston in 1848.

¹Ibid.

²Annual Report of the Board of Education of the St. Louis Public Schools, chap. xxii, Appendix. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1861.

³Ibid., pp. 170-71, 1875.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 171.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

The Quincy school, according to the report of the superintendent of Boston for 1874, was a radical innovation.¹ The building contained twelve schoolrooms, four on each of the three floors, and had a large hall on the fourth floor.² This type of building remained the model for the grammar schools of Boston for many years.

In 1860 the superintendent of Boston, working with an experienced architect prepared model plans for primary schools.³ These model primary schools contained six schoolrooms, one for each grade of the primary school, and each room of the building was twenty-eight feet square and thirteen feet high. The pupils were to be seated so as to face a blank wall and the light was to be admitted on the left side of the pupil in preference to the right.⁴ After four or five years of determined effort, largely on the part of the superintendent, the city council agreed to furnish single desks and chairs for the primary pupils.⁵

The superintendent of Baltimore in the report for 1889 suggested that the school district should adopt a plan for a model school building.⁶ He realized the necessity for arriving at some definite standard with respect to the amount of air and floor space allotted to each pupil. In the report for 1891 school buildings were again mentioned; the schoolrooms of the new buildings were too small, the construction was such that the buildings were noisy, wooden instead of plaster ceiling had been used, and there was no way of deadening the sounds made by moving pupils.⁷

The superintendent of Rochester discussed school buildings in the report for 1863.⁸ In the seven years from 1850 to 1857 seven schoolhouses had been built in Rochester. No two of the seven buildings were alike; there was no general plan; and there was not a good building in the seven, according to the opinion of the superintendent.⁹ This condition, in his judgment, was caused by the lack of intelligent direction and the failure to employ an

¹Report of the Boston School Committee, pp. 318-22.
Boston: School Committee, 1874.

²Ibid., pp. 318-19.

³Ibid., p. 321.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 322.

⁶Report of Board of Commissioners of Public Schools,
pp. 47-48. Baltimore: Board of Commissioners, 1889.

⁷Ibid., pp. 46-47, 1891.

⁸Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools,
p. 40. Rochester: Board of Education, 1863.

⁹Ibid.

architect. In the report of the superintendent for 1855 the comment was made that some people in the city had objected to the policy of the board of education in erecting large school buildings.¹ The superintendent maintained that it was economical to erect the larger buildings, since the site necessary to accommodate a building large enough to seat two hundred pupils cost no more than the site necessary to erect a building which would seat five hundred or a thousand pupils.² It was cheaper to add additional stories to a building than it was to erect another building.³

The superintendent of Milwaukee in the report for 1873-74 expressed the hope that Milwaukee would never erect a school building without an auditorium. The auditorium or hall was considered necessary in order to assemble the entire school and also as a means of bringing the parents to the school.⁴ In the same report he suggested that the city council should purchase a site for a new high school building.⁵ The superintendent thought the high school should be located near the center of the city, and should be a center of culture for the entire community, providing evening classes, a library, and a museum.⁶

A number of factors operated in the earlier period to make for a lack of intelligent direction in the erection of school buildings. Boards of education were elected by wards, the interests of the members were centered in the wards, and ward political interests dictated much of the procedure in the location and erection of school buildings. In a number of cities the city council or some board affiliated with that body had charge of the location and erection of school buildings. In most cities the funds for the purchase of sites and erection of school buildings were provided through the city council and not directly through the board of education. Most city boards of education transacted their business through committees, and the committee on school buildings handled the affairs connected with the erection of school buildings. Some or all of these factors made the superintendent of schools for many years an officer of little consequence

¹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools of the City of Rochester, pp. 11-12. Rochester: Board of Education, 1855.

²Ibid., p. 11.

³Ibid., pp. 11-12.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners of the City of Milwaukee, pp. 54-55. Milwaukee: Board of School Commissioners, 1874.

⁵Ibid., p. 53.

⁶Ibid., p. 38, 1877.

in the matter of school building planning and construction.

A large part of the superintendent's connection with school buildings during the earlier period had to do with the service facilities of the buildings. Improved methods of heating, lighting, and ventilating school buildings were discussed by the superintendents in their reports.

The superintendent of the Providence schools discussed school buildings in the report for 1854.¹ He recommended that the school buildings be heated by furnaces, as a means of securing proper heating and ventilation. In the report for 1869 the superintendent made the claim that the increase in defective eyesight was due to poorly lighted school buildings. He insisted that in most of the schoolrooms of New England, either the teacher or the pupils had to face a strong light.² In the report for 1874 he asserted that the schoolrooms in use by the primary and intermediate pupils of Providence were nearly all unsatisfactory.³ The rooms were low, dark, inconvenient, badly conditioned, uncomfortably furnished, and not ventilated at all.⁴ Finally, in the report of the schools for 1876, a special committee reported on the subject of school ventilation. The report stated that the plan for the ventilation of school buildings devised by the superintendent of the Providence schools had been tried out in two school buildings in the city and had proved to be a complete success.⁵

The superintendent of the Rochester schools in the report for 1886 asserted that twenty-three of Rochester's thirty school buildings were not properly ventilated.⁶ Most of the twenty-three buildings were heated by stoves -- a condition that made ventilation extremely difficult. The superintendent realized that to provide steam heating facilities for all of the buildings in one year would entail a greater expenditure than the school district was able to afford. His recommendation was that a plan be adopted by means of which a few of the buildings would be modernly equipped during each year.⁷

¹Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Providence, Presented to the City Council, pp. 23-24. Providence: School Committee, 1854.

²Ibid., pp. 40-41, 1869.

³Ibid., pp. 4-5, 1874.

⁴Ibid., p. 5.

⁵Ibid., pp. 38-39, 1876.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 75.

Rochester: Board of Education, 1886.

⁷Ibid.

The superintendent of the Louisville schools was required to report to the board of education whenever, in his opinion, the provisions for warming, ventilating, or lighting of schoolhouses were unfavorable to the health and physical development of the pupils.¹ In the report for 1860-1861 he made a strong plea for more satisfactory conditions in the matter of the heating, lighting, and ventilation of the school buildings. The superintendent was of the opinion that there should be no cessation of effort along those lines until all of the buildings had been improved.² In the same report he urged the board of education to supply seats and desks for the primary rooms, because the little primary grade children were compelled to sit hunched up in small chairs in a manner that was detrimental to their health and physical well being.³ This report on furniture was strictly in keeping with the duties of the superintendent, as he was required to inspect the grounds, buildings, furniture, and apparatus of the schools and report back to the board of education.⁴

The school report of Milwaukee for 1879 discussed the method of heating used in a number of the school buildings. About 200 stoves were in use in the schoolrooms of the city at that time.⁵ The space occupied by these stoves displaced at least seven hundred pupils, and the stoves were, furthermore, unsatisfactory from the point of view of both heating and ventilating.⁶ In the same report the superintendent urged the board of education to insist that the common council make plans to change the mode of heating of at least four of the school buildings during that year.⁷ The fact that a new school building, equipped with the best methods of heating, lighting, and ventilating had been erected in Milwaukee during the year probably had a strong influence on the recommendation to discontinue the use of stoves.

The report of the superintendent of New York for 1856 devoted considerable space to recommendations on school buildings.⁸ The report cited the fact that the furniture of the schools was

¹Report of the Board of Education, pp. 76-77. Louisville: Board of Education, 1861.

²Ibid., p. 76.

³Ibid., p. 77.

⁴Ibid., p. 46, 1862-72.

⁵Report of the Milwaukee School District, p. 19. Milwaukee: Board of Education, 1879.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City and County of New York, pp. 34-37. New York: Board of Education, 1856.

convenient and well adapted to its purpose, and that there was no longer any just complaint to be made against the furniture in use.¹ The two great wants of the day, the report stated, were cheap and effectual ventilating machinery and apparatus for heating air without impairing its life sustaining properties. In the report for 1884 the superintendent seemed entirely satisfied with the ventilating, plumbing work, and general sanitary conditions of the school buildings recently erected.² In the report for 1890 he recommended that, wherever possible, corner lots be secured for school buildings.³ The report for 1891 suggested that it was desirable for the air and floor space per pupil in school buildings to have a higher minimum than that prescribed by the law then in existence.⁴

Rapidly Increasing School Enrolment

A period came in the development of most city school systems when the problem of supplying sufficient accommodations for the rapidly increasing school enrolments became acute. It was during this period that the superintendent of schools began to become a real factor in the business of supplying school buildings. Table XVII gives the increase in school enrolments during two thirty-year periods of twenty-six cities of the United States. The data from which the table was compiled were taken from the biennial reports of superintendents of city schools submitted to the United States Office of Education.

The data presented indicate that the period from 1900 to 1930 showed more rapid growth in the school enrolments of twenty-two of the cities than did the period from 1870 to 1900. In the period from 1870-1900 four cities showed an increase in school enrolment of more than 50,000, while in the later period, 1900 to 1930, ten cities showed an increase of more than 50,000. New York showed the greatest increase for each of the periods. Nashville showed the smallest increase during the first period and Providence showed the smallest increase during the second period.

In the period from 1900 to 1930 Los Angeles showed the largest percentage of growth in enrolment, 1248 per cent, or from 20,497 in 1900 to 276,383 in 1930. The smallest percentage, 27 per cent, was shown by St. Louis, from 78,263 in 1900 to 99,272 in 1930. For the sixty-year period from 1870 to 1930 the largest

¹Ibid., p. 36.

²Ibid., pp. 172-73, 1884.

³Ibid., p. 146, 1890.

⁴Ibid., p. 164, 1891.

TABLE XVII

INCREASE IN SCHOOL ENROLMENT OF TWENTY-SIX SELECTED CITIES
OF THE UNITED STATES DURING TWO THIRTY-YEAR PERIODS
(1870-1900 and 1900-1930)

City	Increase in Enrolment 1870-1900	Increase in Enrolment 1900-1930
Atlanta.....	13,069	39,673
Baltimore.....	39,363	52,632
Boston.....	45,021	62,777
Chicago.....	216,922	268,169
Cincinnati.....	23,120	16,277
Cleveland.....	45,830	101,939
Columbus.....	12,903	28,929
Denver.....	11,223	38,473
Detroit.....	27,898	233,325
Kansas City.....	24,514	43,802
Los Angeles.....	20,027	255,886
Louisville.....	16,216	16,716
Milwaukee.....	31,083	47,349
Minneapolis.....	33,059	51,665
Nashville.....	8,782	17,065
New Haven.....	10,443	18,430
New Orleans.....	9,980	32,146
New York.....	283,655	611,824
Philadelphia.....	68,564	150,577
Portland.....	11,803	43,608
Providence.....	23,629	13,529
Rochester.....	13,417	30,963
San Francisco.....	25,906	28,788
Seattle.....	10,633	55,597
St. Louis.....	53,816	21,009
Washington.....	35,760	34,384

percentage, 5870 per cent, was shown by Los Angeles.

The superintendent of New York mentioned the overcrowded condition of the school buildings in the report for 1873.¹ He felt that the overcrowding of the schools was the most serious evil connected with them at that time, and he offered the suggestion that the board of education fix a limit to the capacity of every building, hall, and classroom of the city school buildings. The overcrowding of the schools was again mentioned in the report for 1877, in which the superintendent recommended that the board of education enforce its rule requiring a minimum of one hundred cubic feet of air space per pupil.² In 1881 the number of children who, on account of lack of room, were refused admission to the schools, was 9,189.³ The compulsory school-attendance act could not be enforced in some parts of the city because of the lack of school accommodations. The superintendent had no definite suggestions to make in this report except that it might be necessary to abridge the grammar school course in some sections of the city.⁴ The situation was further complicated by the presence of large numbers of immigrant children who could not speak English. The report for 1882 mentioned the fact that the problem of sufficient school accommodations was still unsolved.⁵

The attitude expressed by the superintendent of New York in the report for 1896 was somewhat hopeful, on account of the gain of 4872 seats in the primary and grammar schools during the preceding year.⁶ However, 28,825 children had been refused admission to the schools and 10,381 were on part time. The situation was rendered more difficult by reason of the fact that a more rigid compulsory attendance law had been passed and the size of classes had been reduced.⁷ Three suggestions were made in the report for 1901: the first was to transfer and if necessary transport children from more to less crowded buildings; the second was to consolidate classes in the upper grades, thereby making room for the children in the lower grades; the third was to refuse to admit children under six years of age.⁸ The superintendent felt, however, that if it were possible to carry out all his suggestions there would still be the necessity of half-time

¹Ibid., pp. 230-32, 1873.

²Ibid., pp. 120-21, 1877.

³Ibid., pp. 8-10, 1881.

⁴Ibid., p. 10.

⁵Ibid., pp. 7-8, 1882.

⁶Ibid., pp. 142-43, 1896.

⁷Ibid., p. 143.

⁸Ibid., pp. 92-93, 1901.

sessions.¹

Part-time school sessions in the schools of New York were discussed in considerable detail in the report for 1905.² During that year the suggestions that a three and one-half hour school day be made the full school day for children of the first and second grades was proposed, but it was abandoned because of too much opposition on the part of the public. The increase in the number of part-time pupils had reached its highest point, up to that time, during the school year 1902-1903. On June 30, 1902, the number was 35,347; and on June 30, 1903, the number was 56,071, an increase of about 59 per cent.³ The superintendent felt that the part-time system had helped the school system to rid itself of three evils: (1) the refusal of admission to children under school age, (2) classes of enormous and irrational size (previous to the adoption of the part-time plan it was not uncommon to have classes of one hundred pupils and classes having one hundred fifty were known), (3) the plan of having one teacher in charge of two sets of pupils -- one set in the forenoon and a different set in the afternoon.⁴ He was of the opinion that the continuance of the part-time system depended on: (1) the rate of increase in population, (2) the rapidity with which new school buildings could be erected, and (3) the judgment shown in the selection of building sites.⁵ In the report for 1906 the superintendent stated that about eleven per cent of the children in the city schools were on part time. In some parts of the city only the children of the first and second grades were involved, while in other parts of the city the part-time program ran up as high as the fifth and sixth grades.⁶

The situation with respect to overcrowding in the schools of Chicago was much the same as that discussed for New York, except that the number of pupils involved in Chicago did not become as large as did the number in New York. The superintendent of Chicago discussed overcrowding in the report for 1865.⁷ School-rooms with seats for sixty pupils had from seventy to one hundred twenty pupils in attendance. The board of education had rented

¹Ibid., p. 93.

²Ibid., p. 51, 1905.

³Ibid., p. 53.

⁴Ibid., p. 54.

⁵Ibid., p. 55.

⁶Ibid., p. 43, 1906.

⁷Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 6-7.

Chicago: Board of Education, 1865.

all of the outside rooms that could be had in many districts.¹ The superintendent believed that a large number of pupils had remained at home because of the lack of accommodations.

The report of Chicago for 1867 made a plea for a new high-school building.² It was estimated that the entering high-school class would be twenty-five per cent larger than any that had previously entered, and the high-school building was already overcrowded. Some significant figures on the growth of the enrolment of the schools of Chicago were given in the report for 1868.³ In 1864 the enrolment was 38,000 children; in 1868 it was 63,720, an increase of 25,720. The school buildings under contract and erected in that time would accommodate only 9,342 children.⁴ In the report for 1875 the superintendent advised the renting of rooms to accommodate the increasing number of pupils, since it did not seem possible to erect buildings rapidly enough.⁵ He estimated that at least twenty-five per cent of the children of school age were not attending school because no schools were provided for them.⁶ The report in 1877 stated that 6,000 children were in school but a half day and that 5,000 were attending school in rented rooms.⁷ In 1881 the number of pupils on half-day sessions was 7,000 and the number in rented rooms 2,500. It was estimated that to take care of the growth of the schools at least 3,500 additional seats should be provided each year.⁸ The report of the superintendent for 1889 estimated that from six to eight new fifteen-room buildings should be erected each year to accommodate the increase in attendance. Since but half that number had been erected during the several preceding years, the schools were seriously overcrowded.⁹

The report for 1896 discussed an overcrowded condition in the schools of Chicago.¹⁰ The average number of pupils per teacher during the preceding year had been thirty-seven, while in some classes the numbers had reached sixty.¹¹ However, in the same report the statement was made that during the previous year the

¹Ibid., p. 7.

²Ibid., pp. 188-89, 1867.

³Ibid., p. 148, 1868.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., pp. 15-16, 1875.

⁶Ibid., p. 39.

⁷Ibid., pp. 27-29, 1877.

⁸Ibid., p. 64, 1881.

⁹Ibid., pp. 38-39, 1889.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 74-76, 1896.

¹¹Ibid., p. 75.

increase in the number of school seatings had been 115 more than the increase of pupils.¹ Some idea of the problems connected with the growth of enrolment in the Chicago schools is gained from an examination of the statistics presented by the superintendent in the report for 1898. During the seven years from 1891 to 1898 the various divisions of the school system showed the following percentages of growth in enrolment: primary 55.8 per cent, grammar 110.8 per cent, high school 101.4 per cent. In the same period the number of teachers had increased 75.5 per cent.²

The superintendent of Detroit reported 1,559 pupils excluded from school privileges in that city in 1867;³ this number increased to 2,036 in 1869.⁴ The school accommodations available in Detroit in 1869 would have provided a seat for 26 per cent of the number of children included in the school census.⁵ The superintendent was confident that 40 per cent of the children of school age would have attended public schools if there had been rooms for them.⁶

In the report for 1877 the superintendent urged the board of education to take some decisive action to relieve the building shortage.⁷ He had no plans to suggest, except to make the statement that the process of redistricting and of temporary make-shifts had gone to its utmost lengths.⁸ The situation had been eased to some extent in 1881 by placing a large number of the first-grade pupils on half-day sessions. This plan seemed to be meeting with the approval of both teachers and parents.⁹

The report of the superintendent of Cleveland for 1886 stated that in the preceding five years 137 rooms capable of seating 8,250 pupils had been added to the school plant of that city.¹⁰ Despite this seemingly generous provision for increased enrolment, more buildings were needed. The report for 1895 disclosed the fact that two of the high schools of the city had

¹Ibid., p. 16.

²Ibid., pp. 119-20, 1898.

³Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 59-60.
Detroit: Board of Education, 1867.

⁴Ibid., p. 62, 1869.

⁵Ibid., p. 63.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 95, 1877.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., p. 54, 1881-82.

¹⁰Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 13.
Cleveland: Board of Education, 1886.

adopted half-day sessions on account of lack of room.¹ In 1898 there were 5,000 pupils housed in 131 unsuitable rooms being used for school purposes, most of which were imperfectly lighted, heated, and poorly ventilated.² During the two years from 1911 to 1913 the total enrolment in the schools showed an increase of 11,483.³ To care for this unprecedented increase, the superintendent adopted the rotary plan of school organization. By this plan two groups of pupils working under two teachers were accommodated in a single classroom. The pupils rotated in attendance, one group attended school during the first half of the morning and afternoon sessions and the other group during the second half of the sessions. The schoolroom was in use for a greater number of hours each day than would have been the case if only one group of pupils were using it.

The superintendent discussed his method of caring for the increase in pupil enrolment in the report for 1915-1916. In the four years from 1911 to 1915 the average number of pupils per teacher in the elementary schools of Cleveland had been increased from 38 to 42.9, thereby effecting a saving estimated at more than ten elementary school buildings of twenty-four rooms each. By 1916-1917 this increase had been made greater; the elementary teachers were caring for an average of 5.4 more pupils in 1916-1917 than they were in 1911-1912.⁴ The saving that year amounted to over 250 schoolrooms, or ten buildings of twenty-five rooms each.⁵ The high-school increase during the five-year period from 1911 to 1916 was 3,577. The same plan of increasing the number of pupils per teacher was used in the high schools with the result that at least fifty schoolrooms were saved in this department.⁶

The superintendent of the schools of Providence asked for more schoolrooms in the report for 1869. He said that two schools, an intermediate and a primary with two teachers, were crowded into one room in the first ward.⁷ Overcrowding was again mentioned in the report for 1883, when the schools had registered twelve hundred and ninety more pupils than were registered during the previous year.⁸ As a result of this increase it was not unusual to find

¹Ibid., pp. 74-75, 1895.

²Ibid., p. 25, 1898.

³Ibid., pp. 33-35, 1913-14.

⁴Ibid., p. 12, 1916.

⁵Ibid., pp. 12-13, 1917.

⁶Ibid., p. 13.

⁷Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Providence, p. 37. Providence: School Committee, 1869.

⁸Ibid., p. 27, 1883.

seventy, eighty, or a hundred children crowded into a schoolroom intended for fifty children.¹ Three possible means of relieving the overcrowded conditions of the schools were suggested in the report for 1885.² The first was to refuse to admit any more pupils after a certain fixed number had been admitted to each room and grade; the second proposal was that teachers of exceptionally large groups of pupils should be paid larger salaries; the third suggestion was that pupils of the primary grades might attend school for a half day only.³ Providence was behind with school accommodations in 1903, for which year it was estimated that the city was nineteen rooms short of being able to accommodate the increase in school enrolment.⁴ The report also stated that fifteen rooms were in use which were unsuited for school purposes.⁵

The superintendent of the schools of Rochester complained of overcrowding as early as 1855, during which year an increase was reported of one thousand children over the attendance during the previous year.⁶ In the report for 1885 the superintendent recommended the adoption of half-day schools for the young children.⁷ The situation with respect to overcrowding had not improved in 1886. A large number of pupils were being housed in annexes, which were usually dwelling houses, and which were unsanitary and expensive to operate.⁸

The report for 1870 of the superintendent of schools of San Francisco estimated that at least seventeen hundred children of the city were without school accommodations.⁹ In the report for 1879 forty additional classrooms were asked for.¹⁰ The conditions had grown worse in 1883, during which year many of the primary and intermediate grade rooms had enrolments of sixty-five, seventy, seventy-five, and eighty pupils each, the total enrolment had increased over that of the previous year by 2,180 pupils.¹¹

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 17-18, 1885.

³Ibid., p. 18.

⁴Ibid., p. 17, 1903-4.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools of the City of Rochester, p. 12. Rochester: Board of Education, 1855.

⁷Ibid., p. 79, 1885.

⁸Ibid., p. 73, 1886.

⁹Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, p. 19. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1870.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 53-54, 1879.

¹¹Ibid., p. 9, 1883.

At the opening of the school term in 1891 more than five hundred new applicants for seats in the schools of Atlanta could not be admitted; so the board of education rented a private residence and fitted it up for school use.¹ In 1895 it was necessary to adopt the half-day session plan to avoid refusing school privileges to more than two thousand children.²

The superintendent of Denver in the report for 1908-1909 made the statement that if the enrolments in the elementary schools were reduced to 40 pupils per teacher, more elementary schoolrooms would be needed to accommodate the enrolment.³

The data which have been presented show that overcrowding was an early and continuous problem of city school systems. The increase in enrolment had been rapid as is indicated by Table XVII (page 226). The significant fact is that nothing except temporary expedients were proposed. There was nothing suggested which would care for the problem over a period of years. The only plan which had any sort of permanent significance was that followed by the superintendent of Cleveland. However, it is to be expected that a time would come when it would no longer be possible to increase the enrolment in classrooms.

The next section deals with the manner in which the superintendents arrive at a solution of the problem of overcrowding. It will indicate that when the superintendent was given responsibility for devising measures to care for the increasing enrolment of the schools, he was able to provide plans which were adequate.

The Development of School Building Programs

The situation in Denver seems to portray rather definitely the conditions leading up to the adoption of a planned school building program. The report of the superintendent for 1907-1908 showed that the increase of pupils in average daily attendance for that year had been fourteen hundred.⁴ On the basis of this increase and that of the preceding five years he recommended that the Denver School District prepare to spend \$200,000 per year on school accommodations.⁵ The report for 1918-1919 gave a detailed

¹Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 15. Atlanta: Board of Education, 1891.

²Ibid., p. 13, 1895.

³Annual Report of the Denver School District, p. 7. Denver: Board of Education, 1909.

⁴Ibid., p. 7, 1908.

⁵Ibid.

discussion of the old school buildings then in use in the district and the probable length of time they could continue to be used; it also gave the number of pupils on part time and those attending school in rooms unsuited for school purposes.¹ The superintendent and board of education, as a result of this survey, decided to ask the taxpayers for a bond issue of \$8,000,000.² This sum of money was to be used for financing a five-year building program, providing for the construction of three new high-school buildings, six new junior high-school buildings, and twenty-three new elementary-school buildings.³ In addition to the new buildings, it was proposed to recondition one high-school building, three junior high-school buildings and six elementary-school buildings.⁴ The bond issue was authorized in October 1922.

In the report for 1922-1923 the superintendent indicated something of the technique which was used in connection with carrying out the building program.⁵ An assistant superintendent of schools directed the work of architects in planning the buildings, and committees of principals and teachers were asked to submit plans for rooms needed in the teaching of particular subjects.⁶ Standards that had been developed by authorities on the planning of school buildings were constantly consulted in order to insure that the plans were sound in their design.⁷

In 1924 one of the assistant superintendents of the schools of Denver made a careful estimate of the number of school buildings that should be built in the next six years, basing his findings on the records and estimates of the utility companies serving Denver. This study made possible the planning of a building program up to 1932.⁸ After the program was projected it was decided to ask the state tax commission to allow an addition of \$500,000 in the tax levied per year in order to put the program on the current payment basis.⁹ The tax commission allowed only \$281,657.76 per year, which meant that by 1930 it would be necessary to ask the people again for a large bond issue to avert overcrowding in schools.¹⁰

¹Ibid., pp. 32-35, 1919.

²Ibid., p. 35.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 44, 1922-23.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ibid., p. 36, 1927.

⁹Ibid., p. 37.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 38.

The development of the school-building program for Detroit did not follow the same lines as that in Denver. In the report for 1906 the superintendent recommended the erection of one new high-school building, an addition to another high-school building, the erection of two new elementary buildings, and another to replace an old building.¹ During the six-year period, from 1912 to 1918, forty-four new school buildings were erected in Detroit.² In 1919 a school-building survey was started by one of the assistant superintendents, and the recommendations of that survey were incorporated into the 1920-1921 budget of the schools.³ The plan was a comprehensive one which would require a number of years to consummate; ultimately twenty-five new elementary-school plants would be added to the system, but no old building was to be abandoned until it had served its usefulness.⁴ The entire project was to cost about sixteen and one-half million dollars, and when completed it would provide the schools with 25,120 additional seats.⁵

The policies of the housing program of the schools of Detroit were explained by the superintendent in his report for 1922.⁶ These policies were: (1) to provide every child with a full-day school session, (2) to remove all pupils from rented quarters totally unsuited to their needs and requirements, (3) to remove all pupils from damp, poorly lighted basement rooms, (4) to eliminate the risk of fire danger in three-story elementary schools which were built of combustible materials fifty years previously, (5) to reduce class size to forty pupils, (6) to eliminate the use of cheaply built and equipped frame temporary buildings except in emergencies, (7) to provide for growth of school membership in each budget.⁷ The last of the mentioned policies meant that the building program would not be held up by failure of the public to approve bond issues; it was to be continued until the plant had reached the standards set up in the first six policies listed.

The school building program for Baltimore was the result of a survey conducted by an agency outside of the local school system. A summary of a school-building survey, made by an assistant superintendent of the schools, was contained in the

¹Annual Report of Detroit Board of Education, p. 90.

Detroit: Board of Education, 1906.

²Ibid., p. 127, 1918.

³Ibid., pp. 16-17, 1920-21.

⁴Ibid., p. 16.

⁵Ibid., p. 17.

⁶Ibid., pp. 15-16, 1922.

⁷Ibid., p. 16.

report of the superintendent for 1909.¹ Of the 126 elementary-school buildings in use, it was found that less than half were really in satisfactory condition for school use.

As a result of the survey of the schools of Baltimore made by this outside agency in 1920, the citizens authorized a bond issue of \$7,000,000 for the purpose of reconditioning old and erecting new buildings.² In 1922 an additional loan of \$15,000,000 was approved, giving a sum of \$22,000,000 to be expended on the school plant.³ The expenditure of this immense sum was made necessary because of the fact that between 1913 and 1921 only one four-room school building had been erected.⁴ The complete school-building program provided for the erection of two senior high schools, two senior-junior high schools, three junior high schools, twenty new elementary schools, additions to three elementary schools, sites for enlarging playgrounds and for erecting fourteen future new buildings.⁵ In the report for 1926 the superintendent urged a continuance of the building program.⁶ The suggestion made in 1926 evidently carried convictions, as the report for 1929 stated that a loan of \$10,000,000 for school-building purposes had been passed in May, 1927.⁷

It was not until 1924 that New York began seriously to attack the problem of overcrowding which had handicapped her school system for years. The superintendent in the report for 1925 showed that from May 1, 1924 to July 31, 1925, fifty-three new buildings, additions to existing buildings, and temporary buildings had been completed.⁸ These buildings cost approximately \$54,347,500 and provided 93,359 additional school seatings.⁹ The same report indicated that for the next year the board of superintendents had recommended the construction of twenty-seven elementary schools, five high schools and additions to high schools, a new trade school for girls, and an addition to a vocational school.¹⁰ Two new types of elementary schools known as the J and L had been

¹Annual Report of Board of School Commissioners, pp. 13-15.
Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1909.

²Ibid., p. 13., 1921.

³Ibid., p. 28, 1923.

⁴Ibid., pp. 55-58, 1925.

⁵Ibid., p. 57.

⁶Ibid., p. 15, 1926.

⁷Ibid., p. 17, 1929.

⁸Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, pp. 19-20.
New York: Board of Education, 1925.

⁹Ibid., p. 19.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 20.

developed, standards had been agreed upon for rooms intended to accommodate special activities, and the reconditioning of old buildings had been given special study. The superintendent felt that the school buildings of the city were in better condition than they had been for the last twenty years.¹ The next year, from August 1, 1925 to July 31, 1926, fifty-four new school buildings, additions to existing buildings, and temporary buildings were completed and opened.² These buildings provided 79,243 new seatings, and were of the M type which had been recently developed.³ The associate superintendent in charge of the building program had continued work on standards of rooms for the special subjects.

A continuance of the building program activities was indicated in the report of the superintendent for 1928.⁴ He stated that the school-housing problem was complicated by the presence of three factors, namely, (1) the annual increase in the register of regular day schools, (2) the need of providing school accommodations for the continuation-school pupils, and (3) the extensive shifts in population that took place annually.⁵ Caring for the increase in registration was no longer a problem in the elementary schools but it continued to be a problem in the high schools.⁶ Fifteen school buildings had recently been provided to house the continuation-school pupils, but the needs of the continuation schools continued to present a problem. The shift in school population presented a serious problem. In ten years the average daily attendance in Manhattan had decreased 19 per cent, while that of the Bronx had increased 44 per cent, that of Brooklyn 30 per cent, that of Queens 86 per cent, and that of Richmond 42 per cent.⁷

In the report for 1910-1911 the superintendent of the schools of Providence reproduced a report which he had made to the board of education on a school-building program for the city.⁸ The plan included the erection of four new buildings, the sale of certain sites, and action to prevent future building operations from cutting off the light from existing school buildings.⁹ The

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 19-20, 1926.

³Ibid., p. 20.

⁴Ibid., p. 44, 1928.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 45.

⁸Report of the School Committee, pp. 12-15. Providence: School Committee, 1911.

⁹Ibid., pp. 12-13.

report was made to the executive committee of the school committee; this committee concurred in all of the recommendations and prepared to carry them out.¹ A school-building program for Providence was finally adopted in 1925.² The program was begun in the junior high-school plant, since the completion of this plant would relieve both the elementary and high schools.³

The school-building program for San Francisco, according to the report of the superintendent for 1927, consisted of two parts,⁴ namely, the "catching-up" program which was to be financed by a bond issue of \$12,000,000 passed in 1923, and the "expansion" program which was to be financed from current taxation.⁵ By 1927 all of the bond money had been spent or allocated, and the expansion needs of the schools still required the expenditure of approximately \$1,600,000 per year. Since this money was not always provided, the superintendent estimated in 1927 that it would require \$5,200,000 to meet the expansion needs. He was of the opinion that if the money had been raised by a bond issue the schools would not be facing a building shortage at the time.⁶

By 1928 some of the difficulties of raising money by taxation in San Francisco had cleared up and it was possible to go on with the expansion program.⁷ The building needs as listed in the report for 1928 were, one new high school, an addition to an existing high school, additions to several junior high schools, five or six new elementary schools, and additions to several existing elementary schools. The building record of the schools from 1920 to 1929 was summarized in the report of the superintendent for 1929.⁸ In that time three complete senior high schools had been erected and five old buildings had been reconditioned, and six new junior high schools had been built and five old buildings had been reconditioned to make them usable for junior high schools. Thirty complete elementary schools had been finished, eleven additions had been made to elementary schools, and nineteen large buildings of the old type had been abandoned or razed.⁹

¹Ibid., pp. 14-15.

²Ibid., p. 6, 1927-28.

³Ibid.

⁴Annual Report of the Public Schools of the City and County of San Francisco, pp. 29-30. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1927.

⁵Ibid., p. 30.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., pp. 33-34, 1928.

⁸Ibid., pp. 41-42, 1929.

⁹Ibid., p. 42.

The superintendent of Milwaukee made the statement in the report in 1911, that not enough money was being spent on school buildings.¹ He referred to the fact that while Milwaukee had recently set aside \$250,000 for each of two new high schools, the city of Toledo was then erecting three new high schools to cost \$450,000 each. Mentioning the school building situation in the report for 1916, the superintendent estimated that an expenditure of at least \$400,000 per year for ten years would be necessary to provide a schoolroom for each forty-two children without using barracks, basements, or assembly rooms for classrooms.² This amount also included provisions for sanitary toilet facilities, modern heating and plumbing, ample high-school accommodations, and fifty square feet of playground space for each child in each district school.

During the year 1923-1924 the superintendent appointed a committee to make a survey to determine the need for future school sites and buildings in the city.³ This survey committee discovered that the school population of Milwaukee had increased 19,000 in ten years, another finding was that 3,000 children were housed in barracks and more than 6,000 were on half time.⁴ The survey was revised by another committee in 1925 and a five-year building program was adopted, designed to furnish seats for 18,500 children and to require the expenditure of \$2,000,000 per year until the program was completed.⁵

A school building program for the city of Washington was launched through the activity of the superintendent of schools. The school accommodations had been allowed to lapse seriously behind the needs. The shortage in building accommodations was analyzed in the report for 1919-1920, and the appointment of a commission to make a survey of the school building needs of the city was requested.⁶ The superintendent thought the commission should be made up of the superintendent of schools, a representative of the board of education, and the municipal architect.⁷ A summary of the school building needs of the schools was made in the superintendent's report for 1920-1921. There were seventy-

¹Annual Report of the School District of Milwaukee, p. 12. Milwaukee: Board of Education, 1911.

²Ibid., p. 12, 1916.

³Ibid., p. 19, 1924.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., pp. 3-5, 1927.

⁶Report of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, pp. 37-38. Washington: Board of Education, 1920.

⁷Ibid., p. 38.

eight portable schoolhouses in use, four hundred forty-four oversized classes in the elementary schools, most of the high schools had double shifts, forty rented rooms were in use, twenty-eight classes, above second grade, were on part time and many permanent buildings which should have been abandoned were still in use.¹

The five-year building program act for the city of Washington was passed on February 26, 1925, as an enabling act and was operative until June 1, 1930.² The act carried no appropriations, but it was made the duty of the superintendent of schools to indicate in his annual budget the amount necessary for school buildings.³ The act specified that about \$4,000,000 could be spent each year of the five-year period. In the report of the superintendent for 1928-1929 he stated that, up to that time, fifteen new elementary buildings had been erected, eight new junior high schools had been built, and additions had been made to five existing junior high schools.⁴

It has been the purpose of this section to show that when the superintendent of schools was granted the authority to study carefully the school building needs of a city some real progress was made in affording relief for overcrowded schools. The material was selected to show, also, that as the years have passed the superintendent has come from almost no authority in the matter of school buildings to the point where he is the directing authority. The chief factor in this development of authority, it would seem, is the fact that the superintendent has been the one person in the school organization who has been capable of carefully analyzing and evaluating all the conditions entering into the making of provisions for an adequate school plant.

Table XVIII furnished additional evidence of the fact that a greater amount of activity in the erection and alteration of school buildings began after the superintendent was given more authority. School building programs were not launched until after 1900. The earliest date mentioned in the preceding section was for Detroit, 1906, the latest date was for New York, 1924. The data from which the table was compiled were taken from the biennial reports of superintendents of schools submitted to the United States Office of Education.

¹Ibid., p. 45, 1920-21.

²Ibid., pp. 38-39, 1925-26.

³Ibid., p. 39.

⁴Ibid., p. 4, 1928-29.

TABLE XVIII

THE PERCENTAGES OF INCREASE IN AVERAGE YEARLY CAPITAL
OUTLAY IN FIFTEEN CITIES OF THE UNITED STATES
DURING TWO THIRTY-YEAR PERIODS

Cities	Percentage of Increase 1870 to 1900	Percentage of Increase 1900 to 1930
Baltimore.....	507	1974
Boston.....	162	408
Chicago.....	1123	922
Cincinnati.....	12	1384
Cleveland.....	353	1325
Detroit.....	377	4051
Louisville.....	50	50
New Haven.....	115	418
New York.....	1013	700
Philadelphia.....	300	1200
Providence.....	448	404
Rochester.....	650	2536
San Francisco.....	-47	7630
St. Louis.....	249	363
Washington.....	250	1202

The Financial Administration of City School Systems

There are significant differences in the manner in which city school systems secure funds for the support of their schools. In some cities the boards of education have complete control over the determination of the school budget and the levying of a tax to raise the funds needed. In other cities the board of education is required to make an estimate of the funds needed and submit this estimate to another municipal body which has the privilege to grant the request as asked or to modify parts or all of the request. The degree to which the superintendent of schools has participated in the determination of the financial policies of the school districts seems to have been determined, to some extent at least, by the amount of control which the board of education has exercised over the financial administration of the schools.

As early as 1856 the superintendent of the St. Louis schools urged the board of education to begin to make financial provisions for the enlargement of the school plant.¹ The specific recommendation was that the board of education request the State Legislature to grant permission to negotiate a loan, the funds from which could be used to enlarge the school plant.² Again in 1858 the superintendent urged that funds be secured for enlarging the school plant; his suggestions in this report was that the board of education raise funds by discounting some notes which they held. He was quite confident that the current expenses of the schools would require the expenditure of all of the money that could be raised by taxation.³ In the report for 1879 the superintendent listed the amounts of school revenue for the year ending July 31, 1879, that could be derived from four sources, (1) four mill tax, (2) rents, (3) state school fund, (4) fines.⁴

Evidently the four mill tax rate continued in operation in the school district of St. Louis for a number of years, for in 1893 the superintendent made the statement that the four mill tax did not raise sufficient funds for the efficient operation of schools. According to him the schools were being operated at a proportionately less annual cost than any other schools in the state, and he recommended the addition of at least a one-half mill tax for school buildings.⁵ In the report for 1900 he devoted considerable space to a consideration of the financial status and policies of the school district.⁶ The statement was made that no other city or town in the state of Missouri had been able to build up a school system on \$40 per \$1,000 school tax.⁷ He referred to the fact that in Kansas City \$80 per \$1,000 were being levied. The need for additional revenue, he said, had been manifested for thirty years.⁸ The superintendent showed that up until 1875 the board of education was required to make large loans annually. In 1875 a new regulation provided that no more loans could be made and permission was given to increase the tax millage to pay off the existing loans. As a result of this regulation no money was available for the erection of buildings.⁹

¹Annual Report of the School District, p. 39. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1856.

²Ibid., p. 39.

³Ibid., p. 52, 1858.

⁴Ibid., p. 255, 1879.

⁵Ibid., p. 35, 1893.

⁶Ibid., pp. 63-65, 1900.

⁷Ibid., p. 63.

⁸Ibid., p. 64.

⁹Ibid., p. 65.

The plea of the superintendent was for the privilege either of raising the mill rate or floating loans for the improvement and extension of the school plant. His report for 1903 mentioned the fact that permission had been granted to raise the mill rate to \$60 per \$1,000. With the money thus acquired it was necessary to pay current expenses, purchase school sites, and erect new buildings.¹

The superintendent of St. Louis in 1914 advised the board of education that at least one and three-quarter millions of dollars were needed to replace temporary school buildings.² He also suggested a number of extensions to the program of the schools and advised the board of education that the suggestions would entail a considerable outlay of funds.³ In 1916 he mentioned the fact that, on November 11, 1916, the people had approved a bond issue for \$3,000,000 the funds to be used for the purchase of sites and the erection of school buildings.⁴ The report gave, in considerable detail, an outline of the publicity program which the superintendent had used to insure the passage of the bond issue.⁵ In 1920, according to the report of the superintendent, it was necessary to ask the people, in a special election, to approve an additional tax levy of \$15 per \$1,000.⁶ Again in 1922 it was necessary to ask the people to allow a regular tax of \$85 per \$1,000.⁷ In 1923 the superintendent mentioned the service which the division of tests and measurements rendered, this bureau gave him valuable help on matters where it was necessary to recommend the disbursements of funds.⁸

The school district of Houston shows an interesting transition from fiscal dependence to fiscal independence, and the activities of the superintendent of the schools seem to have played an important part in the change. In the report for 1901-1902 he discussed lack of funds for that school year, as insufficient money was available to meet the pay-rolls and pay for supplies and repairs.⁹ The superintendent recommended two

¹Ibid., p. 32, 1903.

²Ibid., pp. 290-91, 1914.

³Ibid., p. 291.

⁴Ibid., p. 281, 1916.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid., p. 29, 1920.

⁷Ibid., p. xii, 1922.

⁸Ibid., p. 20, 1923.

⁹Annual Report of the Public Schools of the Independent School District of the City of Houston, pp. 5-6. Houston: Board of Education, 1902.

alternatives, namely, either have the school money turned over to the board of education when it was collected, or turn the operation of the schools over to the city government.¹ In the report for 1911-1912 he was more hopeful, since the city commission had granted an increase of \$30,000 in the budget for the next year.² In addition to this increase, the people had voted a bond issue or \$500,000 for the erection of a senior and junior high school. The people of Houston, the superintendent said, were more willing to vote money for schools than they were to vote it for streets, sewers, or parks.³

On recommendation of the superintendent made in 1918 the citizens of Houston were given the opportunity to vote on the question of levying a separate tax of fifty cents on the hundred dollars for maintenance purposes of the schools.⁴ The vote was favorable and the extra tax was levied. This tax provided an additional fund of \$200,000 annually and, in the opinion of the superintendent, put the schools on a logical and rational basis of support.⁵

Finally in 1922 the citizens of Houston took the step which made the school district fiscally independent. On December 30, 1922, a special election was held on the appointment of a commission to appear before the Legislature to request the passage of a law which would separate the schools of Houston from the city government.⁶ The vote was favorable to the appointment of the commission and the law was signed by the Governor on March 20, 1923.⁷ Later, at the election at which the voters decided to have an elective board of education, the tax rate was fixed at seventy-eight cents on the hundred dollars.⁸

The schools of Providence became partially independent financially in 1896, and in that year the board of education was given the privilege of fixing its own appropriations, provided the appropriations remained within certain defined limits.⁹ This arrangement gave the administration the means of knowing what amounts of money would be available and the further assurance

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 11-13, 1912.

³Ibid., p. 12.

⁴Ibid., p. 31, 1918-19.

⁵Ibid., pp. 6-7, 1919-20.

⁶Ibid., pp. 5-7, 1921-22.

⁷Ibid., p. 6.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Report of the School Committee, p. 8. Providence: School Committee, 1926.

that appropriations would not be cut so long as they remained within the limit fixed by law. After 1896 the reports of the superintendent of Providence showed a decided increase in attention given to financial affairs. Whether this fact is due to more liberal allowances or to the changing conditions in the practices of school administration is not evident from the reports.

In the report for 1911-1912 the superintendent recommended that free higher education and free kindergarten training be established in Providence; he estimated that the annual cost of these extensions to the school program would total from \$200,000 to \$250,000.¹ The superintendent declared in the report for 1915-1916 that it was impracticable to secure a definite indication of the voice of the people upon the various questions that enter into school finances.² He felt that the most reliable basis for a consideration of school expenditures was through a comparison of the expenditures of the local system with those of similar cities. With this thought in mind the superintendent made a comparison of Providence with twenty-five other cities, over the five-year period from 1910-1915, Providence ranked well below the median in all items except wages of janitors, fuel, and maintenance.³ In 1926 the superintendent was made responsible for the preparation of the school budget. The regulation stated that it would be the general policy of the committee that resolutions authorizing the expenditure of funds should be initiated only by the superintendent.⁴ The further provision was made, however, that no member of the committee was to be denied the right to make such resolutions.⁵

The school district of Milwaukee was given more control over its financial measures in 1905. It is thus possible to examine the financial administration of the Milwaukee schools both as a financially independent and a financially dependent city. The report for 1887 contained the statement that the board of education could only petition for additional schoolrooms.⁶ The superintendent, in the report for 1889, complained that there was too much delay in the erection of school buildings.⁷ It was his opinion that by the time a bond issue had actually been spent the

¹Ibid., p. 47, 1911-12.

²Ibid., pp. 35-37, 1915-16.

³Ibid., pp. 36-37.

⁴Ibid., pp. 7-8, 1926.

⁵Ibid., p. 8.

⁶Annual Report of the School Board of the City of Milwaukee, p. 26. Milwaukee: Board of Education, 1887.

⁷Ibid., p. 68, 1889.

school district would be in greater need for schoolrooms than it had ever been.¹ He attributed the delay to the fact that the board of education did not have direct control over financial and building affairs.² In the same report the statement was made that the introduction of free textbooks had been urged, and that the only serious objection was the expense involved; however, the final decision had been left to the common council.³

In the report for 1891 the superintendent again referred to the building needs of the schools, making the recommendation that some extraordinary measure be adopted to meet the present needs and that annual appropriations be made to take care of annual increases in the school population.⁴ The first report after the school district had become financially independent took on a much more optimistic tone. The change in the organization of the board had made it possible to consider the financial administration of the schools in a much broader and more intelligent manner. The largest bond issue ever voted for schools, \$360,000 had just been granted, and there were also to be sufficient funds for repairs.⁵ The superintendent in his report for 1907-1908 commented on the changes in school construction in the city since the board of education had charge of the plans.⁶ He stated that by eliminating extra expense for beautifying and decorating the school grounds, the Milwaukee school district was getting for \$4,000 per room as good buildings as were costing other cities \$6,000 per room.⁷

The superintendent of Milwaukee was, at one time, a member of the Publicity Committee of the National Education Association. In his annual report for 1917 he reproduced the unanimously adopted report of the Committee of the Department of Superintendence on "Relations between Boards of Education and Superintendent." The latter report expressed the view that,

"There is no problem in which the obligation of the Board to the people whom they represent is more clearly exemplified than in this problem of organizing and distributing finances. It is a fundamental mistake for the board of education to assume that it is called upon to spend the funds of the school

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 28, 1905.

⁴Ibid., p. 63.

⁵Ibid., pp. 21-23.

⁶Ibid., p. 15, 1907-8.

⁷Ibid.

system. It should organize expenditure and create the proper machinery for making expenditure, but the board is not the spending agent."¹

The Development of Stricter Accounting Procedures

Table XIX shows the percentage of increase in average yearly current expenditures of the schools of seventeen cities during two thirty-year periods. The data from which the table was compiled were taken from the biennial reports of superintendents of schools submitted to the United States Bureau of Education.

TABLE XIX

THE PERCENTAGES OF INCREASE IN AVERAGE YEARLY CURRENT
EXPENDITURES IN SEVENTEEN CITIES OF THE UNITED
STATES DURING TWO THIRTY-YEAR PERIODS

Cities	Percentage of Increase	
	1870 to 1900	1900 to 1930
Baltimore.....	280	642
Boston.....	244	590
Chicago.....	1680	828
Cincinnati.....	189	594
Cleveland.....	948	1553
Detroit.....	957	2856
Los Angeles.....	4346	7516
Louisville.....	281	467
Milwaukee.....	869	1176
New Haven.....	351	617
New York.....	291	1431
Philadelphia.....	286	646
Providence.....	471	586
Rochester.....	659	1419
San Francisco.....	315	554
St. Louis.....	462	628
Washington.....	1052	711

The percentages of increase shown in the table during the period from 1900 to 1930 indicate that the amount of money

¹Ibid., p. 44, 1917.

available for the current expenses of the school systems had increased rapidly. Several deductions may be made from this evidence of growth: (1) strict accounting procedures were necessary because of the volume of business, (2) good business practice demanded strict accounting, (3) the tax-paying public would demand strict accounting, (4) the tax-levying body, whether it be the board of education or the city council, would demand strict accounting.

The superintendent of schools was forced to assume the leadership in the development of stricter accounting procedures. If he expected to continue to receive larger and larger sums of money to operate and expand the schools it was necessary for him to show how and why the money was spent.

The superintendent of Denver in the report for 1918-1919 made a plea for a more uniform accounting system in the cities of the country. He felt that such a system would be invaluable for the following reasons: (1) it would enable one city to compare its expenditures with another, (2) it would be more intelligible to laymen, (3) it would make a better annual budget and a better annual report.¹ He stated that the schools of Denver had adopted the methods worked out by the combined efforts of the United States Census Office, the Association of School Accounting Officers, and a Committee of the National Council of Education on Uniform Records and Reports.² This system enabled him to report, at any time, the per pupil cost of any form of service and the per building cost of any item of maintenance and operation.³

In the report for 1922-1923 the superintendent discussed the system of budget conferences which he held. The conferences were attended by the assistant superintendents, the director of elementary education, the purchasing agent, and the chief engineer. All large expenditures were passed on in the conference as well as those involving new policies.⁴ He made the assertion that these conferences insured that the needs of the schools in the way of equipment, supplies, and repairs would meet with quick consideration and that all of the schools would be treated alike.⁵

The school survey of Baltimore recommended that the board of school commissioners operate on a budget classified under seven

¹Annual Report of School District Number One of the City and County of Denver and State of Colorado, pp. 35-36. Denver: Board of Education, 1919.

²Ibid., p. 36.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., pp. 73-74, 1923.

⁵Ibid., p. 74.

heads, namely, the classification of the standard budget referred to in the report of the superintendent of Denver. The survey also recommended that the board of school commissioners should appoint an executive directly responsible to the superintendent of schools to have charge of the establishment and operation of an adequate system of cost accounting.¹ This official was to make a continuous study of the needs of repairs to buildings and equipment, a careful study of building needs, the best location for new buildings as determined by shifts in population, and the standardization of supplies and equipment.² The report of the superintendent for 1929 mentioned the installation of a new accounting system to provide detailed costs by schools.³ The same report made the announcement that on April 5 the title of director of business management had been changed to assistant superintendent, the business department was now organized on the principle that its purpose was to serve educational needs.⁴

The superintendent of Cleveland in the report for 1910-1911 stated that the accounting system of the Cleveland schools had been reorganized so as to show the exact amounts expended on each type of school and on each special line of work.⁵ He was of the opinion that the increasing cost of education would make it necessary to select those activities which were of the most good to the greatest number of pupils, and that school accounting must contribute its share to that end.⁶ In the report for 1917-1918 the superintendent announced that a thorough study of school finances had resulted in the formulation of a budget plan which had been on trial since January 1, 1918 and had proved invaluable even though it was only tentative.⁷ He was convinced that the budget plan should be developed and made a permanent policy.⁸

The superintendent of Detroit explained Detroit's procedure, in adopting a budget plan, in the report for 1920.⁹ A few years previous to 1920 the city had adopted a cost accounting

¹Annual Report of Board of School Commissioners, p. 34.

Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1921.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 17, 1929.

⁴Ibid., p. 35.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 5-7.

Cleveland: Board of Education, 1911.

⁶Ibid., pp. 6-7.

⁷Ibid., p. 25, 1917-18.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Annual Report of the Detroit Board of Education, p. 19.

Detroit: Board of Education, 1920.

system based on the student hour; after this had been done the budget plan was adopted.¹ Three factors were considered in adopting the budget plan: (1) to make the budget conform to the accounting system, (2) to follow the general divisions recommended by the United States Bureau of Education and the National Association of School Accounting Officers, (3) to build around these principles a procedure that might fit conditions in any community.²

The method of presenting the school budget was explained in the report for 1920.³ The various departments began by compiling their departmental estimates about September 1. These estimates were sent to the director of the budget sometime in October. The estimates were then analyzed with department heads, and suggestions were given and changes made. The requests were next compiled in temporary form and given to the superintendent and his assistants for consideration. They were then placed in form to be presented to the survey committee of the board of education, not later than the second week in December. After analysis and revision, the budget was presented by the board of education to the city council for approval on or before January 1. After approval the budget was sent to the city controller on or before January 17 to be incorporated as a part of the other city budget requests.⁴

The budget regulations for the school system of Providence were explained in the superintendent's report for 1926.⁵ The superintendent was required to present his budget to the school committee at the first regular meeting in January of each year. The budget showed the sums necessary to be appropriated by the city council from the general tax levy for the support of the schools for the following fiscal year.⁶ After it was approved by a majority of the members of the school committee it was to be certified and filed with the city council and the commissioner of education by the chairman of the school committee.⁷

The superintendent of Portland in the report for 1927 explained changes he had made in the preparation of the budget, such as the separation of the building fund, debt fund, and budget

¹Ibid., p. 20.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 29.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Report of the School Committee, p. 7. Providence: School Committee, 1927.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

fund.¹ The method proved quite satisfactory and helpful, and the superintendent expressed the feeling that the budget was the most complete of any ever compiled for the school district.² Three main objects were kept in mind in compiling the budget: (1) that it should be a statement which could be studied and analyzed by the average taxpayer, (2) that it should serve as a financial guide throughout the entire year, (3) that at the close of the year a comparison should be made with the financial statement. This comparison was to be made for the purpose of ascertaining whether emergencies or unforeseen conditions had forced a deviation from the budget.³

Some of the budget and accounting practices which had recently been adopted in San Francisco were explained by the superintendent in the report for 1927.⁴ A tabulation of the exact cost of the schools built since 1918 had been started under four headings, namely, buildings, grounds, plans, and equipment. Continuing tabulations of the amounts of money allowed in the annual budget for various sub-departments were made, since such tabulations would become increasingly important in preparing future budgets.⁵

The attempts to install a more complete accounting system in the schools of Washington were discussed in the superintendent's report for 1913-1914.⁶ The original purpose of the reorganization had been to secure a well-organized and centralized system of accounting and control of the finances and property of the public school district. Such a system would be a help in conducting the business without financial loss, and would also have value in expressing the results of the business in an accurate, intelligent, and usable form.⁷ After the work was started, it was discovered that the task was of greater magnitude than had been expected. In his report for 1915-1916 the superintendent asked for more office space and a larger force for the department of business and finance.⁸ In 1917-1918 reference was again made to the need

¹Annual Report of the School District Number One of Multnomah County, Oregon, Including the City of Portland, p. 18. Portland: Board of Education, 1927.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Annual Report of the Public Schools of the City and County of San Francisco, p. 28. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1927.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Annual Report of the Schools, pp. 27-29. Washington: Board of Education, 1914.

⁷Ibid., p. 28.

⁸Ibid., p. 59, 1915-16.

for additional help in the office. In this report the superintendent recommended that an assistant superintendent be appointed to have charge of business affairs.¹

The report of the superintendent of Washington for 1918-1919 described a board of appropriations, which had recently been authorized.² The board consisted of the superintendent of schools as chairman, the assistant superintendent in charge of colored schools, the assistant superintendent in charge of white schools, and two other persons chosen by the superintendent.³ The function of the board was to receive and consider all applications for the allotment of appropriations for the school system. The board adopted the procedure of inviting school principals, supervising principals, and directors to come before it for advice and council.⁴ The report further stated that "on the basis of recommendations made and suggestions received all lump sum appropriations had been divided for the school year in accordance with the law and good administrative practice."⁵

The cost accounting and budgetary procedures in use in Columbus were explained in the report for 1917-1923.⁶ The first was the adoption of a budget system. Heads of departments were held responsible for budgeting the least amount of money necessary for their departments and were not allowed to use more than was budgeted. In the second place comparative studies of expenditures by departments and by buildings for janitor service, fuel, light, power, water, and supplies had been made and copies of the studies had been placed in the hands of the employees. In the third place, careful program making had been adopted. The assignment of the load to each teacher had been made as nearly uniform as possible throughout the city. The last measure alone had saved more than \$100,000 per year.⁷

Public Relations of City School Systems

The superintendent found himself confronted with a complex group of people and interests when he began to plan for a program of public relations. The board of education had to be kept

¹Ibid., pp. 88-89, 1917-18.

²Ibid., pp. 26-27, 1919.

³Ibid., p. 26.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 27.

⁶Annual Report of the School District, p. 30. Columbus: Board of Education, 1923.

⁷Ibid.

informed on matters relating to the school system. The patrons of the schools needed a type of information differing from that presented to the board of education. If the public relations program were to function effectively, the teaching staff must co-operate to the fullest extent. The teaching staff must be supplied with information which differed from that provided for either the board or the patrons.

The first type of publicity material used by superintendents of schools was the annual report. It was issued on the assumption that the public expected and demanded an accounting from the board of education which had been chosen to direct the affairs of the schools. The annual report served to keep the board of education informed on the conduct of the schools. It was not, however, of much value as a publicity medium for the general public. The materials included in the report were frequently technical, the report was often large, and the cost of its publication made wide distribution prohibitive.

The remainder of this section will be devoted to an enumeration and analysis of some of the agencies which superintendents of schools have used in developing programs of public relations. The importance of securing the coöperation of the entire group of citizens in the work of the public schools of the city is well expressed in the annual reports of the superintendents of Denver and Philadelphia.

The superintendent of the schools of Denver attributed the progress which the schools had made, in the period from 1920 to 1926, to the loyal coöperation of the whole community.¹ The board of education had applied a clear-visioned and courageous leadership but the efforts of the board would have availed little without the support of the public. The superintendent of Philadelphia in the report for 1927 made the statement that one of the most important duties in the administration of a large system of schools was to keep in close and effective coöperation with the community.²

Parent-teacher associations.- In the report for 1913 the superintendent of schools of Denver commented on the good work which the local parent-teacher organization had done during the year. He felt that the organization expressed a good will which portrayed the loyalty of both parents and teachers to the school

¹Twentieth Annual Report of School District No. 1 in the City and County of Denver, pp. 8-10. Denver: Board of Education, 1923.

²Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, p. 26. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1927.

system.¹ Much of the credit for the passage of a \$6,150,000 bond issue in 1921 was given to the active interest of the association.²

The report of the schools of Philadelphia for 1912 mentioned the activity of the Home and School Association.³ The superintendent stated that this organization was doing splendid work in making possible a clearer understanding between the school and home. In the report for 1913 he asserted that the Home and School League had brought about 200,000 visitors to the schools during that year.⁴ The report for 1915 discussed a series of school and Home League meetings which had been held in the interest of the launching of a new course of study in health for the schools.⁵

In Chicago the name "Community Centers" was given to the organizations that were formed in the interest of establishing a closer affiliation of the school and home.⁶ The board of education directed thirty-seven such centers in 1917-1918,⁷ the centers were particularly interested in better civic conditions in the communities. The superintendent stated that each school principal was able to direct the activities of the organizations along lines which met the needs of his particular school.⁸

There were seventy-three Parent-Teacher Associations in San Francisco in 1926.⁹ The average monthly attendance of sixty-nine of the organizations in 1926 was 19,850. The report for 1927 listed the activities in which the clubs had engaged during the year. Among the activities were a study of the adolescent child, a study of the San Francisco school system, the establishment of a child-guidance bureau and the conduct of a survey of handicapped children.¹⁰ In his report for 1929 the superintendent asserted that the organizations helped to create an atmosphere conducive

¹Tenth Annual Report. School District Number One of the City and County of Denver, Colorado, p. 12. Denver: Board of Education, 1913.

²Ibid., p. 35, 1920-23.

³Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, p. 9. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1912.

⁴Ibid., p. 4, 1913.

⁵Ibid., p. 20, 1915.

⁶Sixty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education, pp. 114-16. Chicago: Board of Education, 1918.

⁷Ibid., p. 114.

⁸Ibid., pp. 114-15.

⁹Annual Report of the Public Schools of the City and County of San Francisco, p. 15. San Francisco: Board of Education, 1926.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 42, 1927.

to a unified educational effort in home, school, and community.¹ In the same report the activities for the year were listed as: (1) courses in parent education, (2) conduct of cafeterias and lunchroom service in elementary schools, (3) philanthropic service as an agency under the community.²

In 1914 there were 224 organizations in New York City developed for the purpose of securing coöperation between the school and home.³ At that time there was no definite evidence to show the scope of activity or the nature of the service of each organization. The superintendent of schools in his report for 1925 urged each principal of an 8B or Junior High School to organize a parents' association.⁴ He thought such organizations would insure the willingness of the parents to coöperate with the school when needed. In the report for 1927 the statement was made that the organizations of Mothers' Clubs and Parent-Teacher Associations had shown a widespread growth.⁵ The parental contact and co-operation secured by the organizations was thought to be a vital and permanent influence on the work of the schools.⁶ During the 1928 school term the United Parents Association held an exposition which indicated to the citizens of New York the kind of work that both the public and private schools were doing.⁷ The exposition showed the extent of the school program, the quality of the school work, and the creative efforts of the children. The stimulus afforded by the display was considered by the superintendent to be of inestimable value to the schools. Community centers were established in connection with New York's public schools during the period from 1924 to 1929.⁸ The superintendent in commenting on the change, stated that the schools were then becoming, as they should, the center of community activities.

School bulletins.- The establishment of fact-finding bureaus enabled superintendents to supply more and better information than they had been able to offer without the assistance of the bureaus. The Baltimore Bulletin of Education made its first

¹Ibid., p. 58, 1929.

²Ibid., p. 59.

³Department of Education, Division of Reference and Research, pp. 35-36. New York: Board of Education, 1914.

⁴Ibid., p. 284, 1925.

⁵Ibid., p. 23.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid., p. 63, 1928.

⁸Board of Education, Progress of the Public School, May 1, 1924 to July 31, 1929, pp. 99-100. New York: Board of Education, 1929.

appearance in February 1923 under the auspices of the Bureau of Research.¹ The purpose of the publication, as announced by the superintendent, was to supply information to the principals, teachers, the board of school commissioners, other city officials, and the public.² In the report for 1926-1927 the publication of a monthly bulletin was listed among the measures designed to secure closer relationship with the citizens. The bulletins contained specific information about important matters that affected all citizens who had children in school.³

The superintendent of the Kansas City schools began issuing a bulletin in January 1915.⁴ The purpose of the bulletin, as stated by the superintendent in the foreword of the first issue, was to give the parents and taxpayers summaries of the statistical tables of the annual report, to publish plans and policies as they were adopted, and to keep the people more fully informed in regard to the work of the schools.⁵ In February, 1929 the first number of the Kansas City School Service Bulletin was issued.⁶ Five numbers were issued from February, 1929 to March, 1930, dealing with various aspects of the school system particularly those relating to the education of deviate children.

Research Bulletin Number One, Detroit Educational Bulletin, discussed and explained a survey of teachers' salaries and a new salary schedule in 1920.⁷ In 1921 the superintendent reported that the research department prepared for publication the Detroit Educational Bulletin in regular, special, and research numbers.⁸ A monthly letter through which an attempt was made to bring the work of the schools closer to the home was published for parents by the superintendent during the 1922-1923 school term. The bulletin was first discussed by the children as a classroom project and then taken by them to the parents.⁹

¹Annual Report of the Board of School Commissioners, p. 35. Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1923.

²Ibid., p. 36, 1924.

³Ibid., p. 13, 1926-27.

⁴Annual Report of the Board of Education of the School District of Kansas City, pp. 23-24. Kansas City: Board of Education, 1915.

⁵Ibid., p. 23.

⁶Ibid., p. 71, 1929.

⁷Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of Detroit, p. 26. Detroit: Board of Education, 1920.

⁸Ibid., p. 75, 1921.

⁹Ibid., p. 21, 1922.

A monthly official publication of the Denver public schools titled the School Review was started in February, 1919. The superintendent stated that it was his aim through this publication to inform the citizens fully about the aims and problems of their schools, the work accomplished, and the cost.¹ In September, 1921, the director of vocational guidance of the Denver schools was ordered to spend about one-fourth of his time in directing the publicity work of the schools so far as the local community was concerned.² One of the publications for which the director was responsible was the School Review which was now issued five times a year with over 40,000 copies in each issue.³ The superintendent stated that in addition to the School Review, monographs were issued from time to time describing particular functions of the school system.⁴

The public press.- In the report for 1918-1923 the superintendent of Columbus paid tribute to the newspapers of that city.⁵ He felt that much of the progress which the schools had made was due to the judicious and accurate manner in which the three newspapers had handled the news of the school.⁶

One of the duties of the director of vocational guidance of the schools of Denver in managing the publicity program, was to supply weekly information to the daily press.⁷ Important decisions made by the board of education, statistical studies relating to financial or educational activities, and information concerning the activities themselves were given to the press.

The superintendent of Philadelphia acknowledged the generosity and loyalty of the press to the schools in the report of 1914.⁸ The report of the New York schools for 1915 stated that a bureau for filing in detail, reports from newspapers, educational periodicals, and school and college publications had been established.⁹

¹Annual Report of School District No. 1 in the City and County of Denver, p. 32. Denver: Board of Education, 1919.

²Ibid., p. 72, 1920-23.

³Ibid., p. 73.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Report of the Public Schools, p. 35. Columbus: Board of Education, 1923.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Op. cit., p. 72.

⁸Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools, p. 23. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1914.

⁹Department of Education--City of New York Division of Reference and Research, p. 6. New York: Board of Education, 1915.

Wider use of the school plant.- In 1910 the public school system of New York opened an art gallery in a building erected by the district. The building contained in addition to the art gallery, a theatre, a ballroom, meeting rooms, a restaurant, and high-school classes open day and night.¹ The board of education was definitely committed to the erection of school buildings which would include facilities for community activities. Two buildings then under erection had been planned with that end in view.² During the summer of 1928, 375 playgrounds established by the board of education were in operation in New York, and for 1929 the budget provided for the establishment of 431 playgrounds.³ In addition to the summer playgrounds, the board of education of New York coöperated with a number of agencies in establishing summer play schools for anemic and undernourished children.⁴

The report of the superintendent of the schools of Chicago for 1918 mentioned the establishment of summer recreational centers in four school buildings. The movement was thought to be a good one and its extension during the next summer was recommended.⁵

The wider use of school buildings and grounds was mentioned as a desirable objective in the report of the superintendent of the schools of Kansas City for 1928-1930.⁶

The attitude of the school board of Baltimore on the wider use of the school plant was characterized as liberal by the superintendent in the report for 1916.⁷ A recommendation was made in the report for 1923 that a still more liberal policy should be followed in connection with the wider use of the school buildings for community meetings, polling places, and special classes for adults.⁸

Other measures.- A number of measures designed to promote a wider relationship between the school and community were found in several individual cities. In Detroit the equipment of the

¹Annual Report of the Department of Education of the City of New York, pp. 22-23. New York: Board of Education, 1914.

²Ibid., p. 23.

³Ibid., p. 215, 1928.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Annual Report of the Board of Education, p. 122. Chicago: Board of Education, 1918.

⁶Annual Report of the Board of Education for the School District of Kansas City, p. 72. Kansas City: Board of Education, 1930.

⁷Annual Report of Board of School Commissioners, p. 7. Baltimore: Board of School Commissioners, 1916.

⁸Ibid., p. 10, 1923.

visual education department was loaned to community and civic organizations for use in meetings.¹ The schools of Detroit also coöperated with the fire, police and other departments of the city government in the development of a course in safety education.² The Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia coöperated with the schools in an attempt to acquaint the pupils with the advantages and opportunities offered them in their own city.³ The superintendent of schools of New York in the report for 1925 mentioned the fact that he had broadcast a series of talks over the radio.⁴ Ten talks, each ten minutes in length, had been made on subjects closely related to the work of the schools. He expressed the hope that he would be able to continue the talks during the next school year.⁵

A unique and powerful organization known as "The Public School Association" was formed in Baltimore in 1919, for the purpose of forcing the politicians to keep their promises with regard to the schools.⁶ Membership in the association is available to any citizen and organizations are eligible for membership on the same basis as individuals. The working plan of the association is as follows: (1) A general council, made up of one representative from every group belonging to the larger council, which decided the policies. (2) Fifteen persons, elected by the general council to constitute the executive board. (3) No principal, teacher or school official may be a member of the general council or of the executive board.

The general council meets monthly to discuss questions of importance to the school system. The mayor of the city, the superintendents of schools, and the directors in charge of the several departments of the schools appear before the general council meetings to explain the problems pertaining to their positions. Through these discussions the Public School Association sends back to the organizations represented in its membership information on the public schools and the public school program. The association makes five demands on the candidates for mayor of

¹Annual Report of the Detroit Public Schools, p. 40.
Detroit: Board of Education, 1923.

²Ibid., p. 27, 1924.

³Annual Report of the Board of Public Education School District of Philadelphia, p. 20. Philadelphia: Board of Education, 1917.

⁴Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools, p. 317.
New York: Board of Education, 1925.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Mrs. William Baurenschmidt, Letter to the Author,
Baltimore, Nov. 22, 1933.

Baltimore: (1) Not to play politics with the school board in any way. (2) That they accept from a committee of citizens a list of names for consideration when vacancies occur in the school board. (3) That they support, through financial appropriation by the board of estimates, the salary schedule for teachers. (4) That no politics be played with the school employees retirement fund. (5) That no politics be played with the health department.

The Public School Association has been able to develop its power through using the following measures: (1) The school board was removed and has been kept from politics through publicity. A politician who attempts to tamper with the school organization is rewarded by being placed on the back page of the Baltimore papers. (2) The public has been educated to demand that the president of the school board be an outstanding member of the Baltimore bar, known for his independence in politics and his profession. (3) Repairs to school buildings have been removed from the jurisdiction of City Hall and have been made the responsibility of the board of education. (4) The health department has been removed from politics and consequently the health-education program of the schools has been improved. (5) The board of awards has been convinced that it is no longer wise to play politics in awarding contracts for supplies or anything which is connected with the public school system of Baltimore. The association, according to the executive secretary, lists as its principal achievement the support which it has been able to give the present superintendent of schools.

The service which the White-Williams Foundation of Philadelphia renders to the schools and school children deserves mention. The Foundation was incorporated as the Magdalen Society of Philadelphia in 1802.¹ The original purpose of the founders of the society was the reclaiming of erring girls and women.² In 1916 the name of the organization was changed to the White-Williams Foundation.³ The new organization began its work by collaborating with the bureau of compulsory education of the public schools. Responsibility for the careful investigation of the homes and prospective places of employment of children applying for working certificates was undertaken by the society. The investigations disclosed the fact that, in many instances, an important decision

¹The White-Williams Foundation for Girls One Hundred and Nineteenth Annual Report, p. 5. Philadelphia: White-Williams Foundation, 1918.

²Ibid.

³The White-Williams Foundation Five Years' Review, pp. 3-12. Philadelphia: White-Williams Foundation, 1922.

was being made without regard to opportunities, health, fitness, necessity for going to work, aptitudes, talents, or any consideration except the few dollars which the child might earn.¹

The next development in the program of the White-William Foundation was the appointment of school counselors. As the counselors developed their program of work they were led to believe that the child who had decided to quit school was beyond the period where he could be given the most helpful advice. This conviction led to the extension of the work in guidance and counseling to the pupils of the fifth and sixth grades and later to the children entering school. The latter group of children was checked for physical defects which might contribute to their inability to complete successfully the work of the school. When defects were discovered the parents of the children were aided in making use of existing remedial facilities and institutions. The findings of the counsellors are made available for the use of the principals and teachers of the schools.

In the fall of 1921 the Foundation was instrumental in having twenty-five scholarships in "Social Work in the Schools" made available for teachers. Credit is given toward a degree in two of the institutions of higher learning located in Philadelphia. The course includes attendance at lectures and special work on a child or group of children selected by the teacher from his own class. The teacher makes home visits, carefully checks the progress of the child in school, and frequently takes the child to clinics for mental and physical examinations. The founders of the society firmly believe that the activities of the organization are contributing to a better relationship between the schools and the homes of Philadelphia.²

Summary

Early city schools were housed, to a great extent, in buildings which were not the property of the school district. Several factors were responsible for this condition: (1) the schools had been operated privately in privately-owned buildings before being taken over by the city; (2) the enrolment was growing rapidly; (3) finances were not adequate to construct buildings. The growth in enrolment made it necessary for schools to be housed in temporary quarters -- church basements, abandoned dwellings, vacant storerooms, and fire houses converted into school buildings. These quarters were frequently small, poorly lighted and heated,

¹Ibid., p. 4.

²Ibid., pp. 11-12.

lacking in sanitary facilities, and improperly ventilated.

The superintendents were confronted with the problem of getting the schools out of the temporary, unsanitary, and unsuitable quarters and into quarters owned by the school district. This task was made difficult by the lack of funds and by the fact that, in many cities, the erection of school buildings was the responsibility of the city council or some body under the direction of the city council. The superintendents were asking for buildings designed to house a graded system of schools. This was a departure from the traditional type of school building and it tended to complicate the problem. The early superintendents did not have much authority or responsibility in the erection of school buildings. They were, in some cases, directed to advise with the authority erecting school buildings, but their advice was not always asked or heeded after it had been requested.

Overcrowding of city schools continued to be a problem for a great many years, cities grew rapidly and the school enrolments increased at an alarming rate. The fact that boards of education, because of lack of direct control over the construction of school buildings, were frequently powerless to erect sufficient buildings made the problem of overcrowding more intense. The superintendents suggested temporary expedients such as half-day sessions, temporary and cheap buildings, and the housing of the schools in rented quarters, but a satisfactory solution of the problem was not reached.

After 1900 when the boards of education were reduced in size and the superintendent was made the executive officer, some order began to grow out of the chaotic condition. The superintendents attacked the problem of supplying adequate school facilities. Studies were made that showed the annual growth of schools and the trends of the increase in the school population. The existing school plant was surveyed and evaluated, the growth of population studies made by utility companies serving the city were used to estimate growth and the mobility of the growth. The surveys enabled the superintendents to predict school building needs over a period of years and a forward-looking building program was launched. The problem of overcrowding did not entirely disappear, but measures which enabled a larger number of pupils to be accommodated were adopted.

The minor responsibility exercised over the finances of the school district by the boards of education in many cities meant that the superintendent had few duties dealing with financial administration. The boards of education were, in a number of cities, not able to do more than ask for the sum of money necessary to operate the schools; it was seldom possible to secure

the entire amount asked for. In the cities in which the board of education was financially independent of other branches of the city government, the superintendents had more responsibilities for school finance.

During the period from 1900 to 1930 the financial outlay for schools increased rapidly. A larger number of buildings was erected and the school program was rapidly expanded. In order to secure the increasingly large sums of money needed, the superintendent was compelled to urge the adoption of stricter accounting procedures. The adoption of the procedures put the financing of the schools more nearly on a cost of service basis and it also enabled the comparison of the unit costs of one city with those of other cities. The superintendent was able to devise stricter accounting procedures because of the assistance rendered by the fact-finding bureaus which had been established.

Public support of schools is not confined to the payment of taxes. Effective public support means loyal and enthusiastic cooperation with respect to the entire school program. Realizing the value of and necessity for effective public support, the superintendent developed programs of public relations. This was done through supplying information regarding the schools to existing civic organizations, through the establishment of new organizations designed to bring the school and home closer together, and through a program of organized and continuous publicity which included the issuance of school bulletins and cooperation with the press of the city.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Early School Administration without a Superintendent

The early schools of America were administered either by the community as a whole or by some existing civil officers of the community. When the community administered the schools, the control was exercised through the town meeting. The civil officers to whom school control was delegated by some communities were the selectmen, the wardens, the grand jurymen, the feoffes, or the overseers. The administration of the schools of the early period was a simple matter. The communities were small, the school enrolments were few, the course of study was rudimentary, the school plant was crude, and the expense involved was slight. The most important obligations of the administrators were those of compelling attendance of the children and collecting the fees levied for the support of the school. Later when the administrative functions were extended to the instructional problems of the schools, the ministers of the communities were empowered to assist the organization which assumed responsibility for the administrative control of the schools.

The appointment of school committees marked the next stage in the administration of schools. In some cases the school committees were elected by the people assembled in town meetings and in others they were appointed by the organization which had been made responsible for the control of the schools. The idea of a school committee seems to have originated from special committees appointed for specific civil duties, such as the purchase or sale of land or the collection of the school revenue. The school committees were given control over the administration of the schools of the district. They reported and were responsible to the body which had appointed them, to the town meeting, or to the selectmen of the town. The school committee was also responsible for supervising and inspecting the work of the schools at somewhat regular intervals. The increase in the number of schools in the town created problems in connection with the duties and responsibilities of the school committees. The visitation and inspection took more time from the private business interests of the members of the

committees than they were willing to spare. Since each school was usually visited by a different member of the committee it was not possible for the work of one school to be carefully compared with the work of any other school.

The problems indicated led to the next major development in school administration, namely, the authorization of the school committee to appoint, either from its own members or from the citizens at large, an annual visiting committee. This committee was given the definite responsibility for visiting and inspecting the schools and reporting back to the body responsible for its appointment. The members of the visiting committee were frequently paid for the amount of time actually devoted to the work for which they were appointed.

The rapid growth of cities during the first half of the nineteenth century created many new problems of school administration. The type of organization which functioned effectively in sparsely settled or small school districts was not adapted to the more densely populated centers. School enrolments increased rapidly in the cities, school-housing facilities became inadequate, the plans for the organization and management of pupil personnel needed revision. The lay organizations which had been evolved through the years were further modified and expanded. But the modifications left much to be desired in the matter of an efficient organization for the administration of a city school system.

The cities were often lacking in homogeneity as school districts. The school organization which had served the sections which made up the city often retained their entities when the extension of the city boundaries brought the sections within the city limits. When the city was legally constituted a single school district the earlier sectional traditions were still entrenched in the thinking of the people and of the members of the boards of education. The earlier committee organizations were revised and enlarged in an attempt to cope with the increase in the complexity of the problems of school administration. The duties and responsibilities devolving on the lay members of boards of education began to weigh heavily on those officers. There is good reason to believe that the lay boards of education realized their inability to make satisfactory adjustments of the problems which pertained to the instructional phases of the public schools. Moreover, the lay boards were elected for short terms and the administrative organization lacked continuity and permanence. No modification in the existing administrative organization of city school systems was suggested. The opinion seemed to prevail that the existing organization of boards of education was satisfactory. The suggestions were that the existing organization should be supplemented

by a person who would give permanence, personal responsibility, and continued and systematic labor to the administration of city schools. The new officer was destined to be called the superintendent of schools.

The Creation of the City School Superintendency

A number of reasons were given for the creation of the position of superintendent of city schools. In Detroit the superintendent, chosen in 1855, was needed to supervise instruction, grade the schools, and render them more efficient at less expense. In Boston it was felt, among other things, that there was no individual or body to exercise the complete supervision over the schools which was needed, or to examine them as thoroughly as they required. The school committee of Boston also realized that there was no one whose special duty it was to see whether the best course of studies was pursued or to suggest improvements from the experience of the best schools elsewhere. The first superintendent for the schools of Boston was elected in 1851. The superintendent of the schools of New Orleans, elected in 1841, was expected to aid the teachers by suggestion, counsel, and instruction and through his work to give system and efficiency to the schools. The school committee of Louisville elected in 1837 a school agent, who was expected to supervise the schools, keep the financial records, act as secretary of the board, and take charge of the school property.

The lay organization which had been established to administer the schools before the superintendent was appointed was not altered when he took office. The organization continued its work through committees assigned to definite responsibilities, and the superintendent was expected to assist rather than replace the committees. A considerable number of years passed before the size and complexity of the lay organization was reduced. It first grew larger and more complex rather than smaller and less complex.

The superintendent was definitely placed under the authority and direction of the board of education. He was ordered to investigate conditions and practices and to report his findings to the board for consideration by that body. In only rare instances was he given discretionary power to act on situations or conditions not covered by the regulations governing his powers and duties. In three cities -- Atlanta, Nashville, and San Francisco -- the superintendent was designated the executive officer of the board; three cities -- Chicago, Louisville, and Milwaukee -- directed him to serve as secretary of the board. He was sometimes enjoined to attend meetings of the board and to enforce the

regulations adopted by that body. The first superintendent was elected most frequently by the board of education for a term of one year. One city, Milwaukee, set up a professional requirement for the office, namely, that the superintendent must be a graduate of a college or normal school located in the United States.

The duties and responsibilities originally assigned to the superintendent were about equally divided between administration and supervision as the terms are known today. The duties most frequently mentioned were the making of an annual report and the supervision of the schools. The visiting committees which had been given the responsibility for supervision found that the duties consumed a great deal of time. It is also evident that the lay committees realized their incompetency to do any effective supervision. The regulations of the school boards did not define the procedure which the superintendent should use in performing his supervisory duties, but he was directed to report his findings to the board. A duty which ranked high in frequency of mention was that of visiting the schools. In most cases the rules stipulated that the schools were to be visited as often as time would permit, and in a few instances the number of visits which the superintendent was expected to make was designated.

The superintendent at first was not given any great amount of authority over members of the teaching staff. He was directed to assist the committees which examined and certificated teachers, but the nature of the assistance to be rendered was of minor importance. He was not empowered to make final decision on the fitness of candidates for teaching positions. His opinion, if given at all, was presented to a committee of the board which was responsible for examining teachers. He was not granted the privilege of nominating teachers for positions, but was expected to report all inefficient teachers to the board. In a few cities he was made responsible for filling temporary vacancies in the teaching staff, but in rare instances only was he allowed that privilege without first reporting his proposed action to members or a committee of the board. The superintendent was directed to hold teachers' meetings for the purpose of acquainting the teachers with better methods of instruction and discipline.

The responsibilities of the superintendents for school buildings and finance were limited to a few minor matters. Two reasons may be assigned for this limitation. The boards of education had few powers in connection with either buildings or finance, for those responsibilities were retained by other branches of the city government. The superintendents were regarded as head teachers who had no experience in the business phase of school administration.

The board of education was kept informed on the conditions and needs of the schools through the reports made by the superintendent. Reports were made annually in all cities, and some cities expected quarterly or monthly reports in addition to the annual report. In a few cities the superintendent was directed to make a report when called on by the board. The content of the report was seldom specified, although it was generally understood that the report was to deal with the condition of the schools and the means by which they could be improved.

The superintendent was directed to study the school systems in other cities and to keep himself informed on the best methods of conducting schools. This was evidently a substitute for lack of training before assuming the position and was a wise regulation.

The Superintendent as Supervisor and Administrator

When the early superintendents began their duties they found the schools in what might be termed a condition of chaos. Teachers were attempting to find time to instruct in single rooms large numbers of pupils who varied widely both in ability and achievement. The courses of study which were in use were meager both in content and in specific directions for the organization and presentation of the materials to be taught. The examination, promotion, and classification of pupils, in a number of cities, had been for years the responsibility of the lay members of examining committees. There were no well defined standards for promotion and in some cases promotion from one class of school to another was made on the basis of overcrowding in the lower school. The promotion exercises and frequently the examination of the pupils had been made gala occasions for public displays. The tradition which surrounded these practices made it necessary for the superintendent to move slowly in his attempts to modify them.

The members of school boards or school committees were not always in unanimous agreement on the need for a superintendent of schools. The school committee of Boston was divided in 1847; one group favored the employment of a superintendent and another group believed that the needs could and should be met either by having a small executive committee of the school committee or by having a part or the whole of the school committee paid for their services. In a number of cases the teachers and the public were not convinced that the new officer was necessary.

Before a beginning could be made on the problems of gradation and promotion of pupils and of courses of study, it was often necessary for the superintendent to ask for the alteration of existing school buildings. He also found that he needed to

make suggestions for radical changes in the plans for the erection of new buildings. The building had to be planned to house adequately a closely graded school. The superintendent met a number of discouraging conditions in this phase of his work. He had only minor authority in the matter of the planning of school buildings. In fact, the boards of education in many cities had very little authority in the construction of school buildings. The city council or some other branch of the city government erected the buildings. The district or ward system which operated in cities constituted another handicap for the superintendent. The pupils residing in one district were averse to attending school in another district, in spite of the fact that the building in one district might be seriously overcrowded while a similar building in an adjoining district cared for a much smaller number of pupils. This condition was almost universal in the upper grades of the grammar schools, and years passed before the superintendents were able to alter it. The boys and girls attended separate schools in some cities, and there was strenuous opposition to the elimination of the practice when better grading required that they attend the same schools. However, the superintendents apparently persisted in their efforts to grade the schools, and in time they were able to substitute better procedures for the haphazard practices which had characterized the efforts of the lay boards of education.

The development of a graded system of schools could not have been consummated if the early superintendents had not been given the authority to supervise the work of the schools. The supervision of the schools was one of the general requirements imposed by the regulations governing the duties and responsibilities of the early superintendents. The number of changes which were being made in the gradation of the schools and the courses of study intensified the need for careful and constant supervision. The inaugurating of a new gradation, the allocation of materials to the several grades, and the development of new courses of study constituted the supervisory program of the superintendent. He could not complete one task before he began another; his efforts had to be directed concurrently on the several phases of the problem. The evidence indicates that in some quarters the teachers and principals were not in complete accord with the plans proposed by the superintendent. In most cases the supervisory staff, including the superintendent, had little or no authority in the selection of teachers. This responsibility was jealously and zealously retained by the lay members of the boards of education. So long as this condition persisted, the problems growing out of the supervisory program were more difficult to adjust by those

persons responsible for the functioning of the program. The lay committees of the boards of education, which had exercised authority over the inspection and supervision of the schools, continued to function after the superintendents were elected. The superintendents were forced to share their responsibilities with these committees. The divided authority and responsibility must have given rise to conditions difficult to administer without offending and antagonizing the lay committees.

The growth of the school systems and the consequent increase in the number and complexity of the duties of the superintendent made necessary an increase in the supervisory staff. The additional help was provided in several different ways. The principals of the grammar schools in some cities were relieved of part or all of their teaching duties and given some supervisory responsibilities for the school of which they were principals. At a later date the supervisory responsibilities of the principals were extended to include a number of primary schools located in the immediate vicinity of the school of which each was principal. The name "supervising principal" was sometimes given to these principals when their responsibilities were increased. This plan of organization was carefully developed in Cincinnati and came to be known, among the superintendents, as the "Cincinnati Plan." Assistant superintendents were employed in most large cities and the supervision of the schools was divided among the staff members of the superintendent. Special teachers were employed to introduce new subjects, such as art, music, penmanship, and physical education. The special teachers became supervisors of their subjects when the school systems grew larger. The superintendent was no longer expected to conduct all the teachers' meetings held in the city, since this responsibility was shared with the supervisory staff.

All the measures which relieved the superintendent from routine duties gave him more time to plan for the improvement and extension of the school system. The chief goal of the superintendent during the early period was the development of a graded system of schools. To achieve the goal he directed his efforts on the erection and alteration of school buildings, the construction of courses of study, the development of standards for promotion, the redistribution of pupils to school buildings, and the supervision of classroom instruction. None of these measures stands out as being of first importance. They were considered merely in their appropriate relationships and sequence. The solution of these problems constituted the program of work for the early superintendents of schools.

A Significant Change in the Status of the Superintendent

The early superintendents found in most cities a cumbersome and inefficient school administrative organization, which had been established when the school systems were small, and had been added to as the cities and the school systems grew. The additions and the consequent increase in complexity of the organization did not cease with the election of the superintendent. He supplemented rather than replaced any of the parts of the organization. The members of boards of education were chosen for short terms either by appointment or by the electorate. It was not uncommon for the entire personnel of the board of education to be changed annually or biennially. The term of the superintendent was also short, frequently one or two years in length. In several cities the superintendent was elected by popular vote for a number of years. San Francisco is the most outstanding example of this method of choice, the superintendent of the schools of San Francisco being elected by the people from 1857 to 1923. A successful and constructive program of school administration requires long-time planning. The inadequate tenure of the boards of education and the superintendent made the development of a well planned program an impossibility. The city charter or the state laws frequently gave the city council or some other branch of the city government so much veto power over the actions of boards of education that the boards were unable to function effectively.

The boards of education, elected on the basis of ward representation, were large and unwieldy. A large number of standing committees of the boards were created, in order, apparently, that each member might have some responsibility. There were as many as twenty standing committees in some cities, with the superintendent of schools failing to have a place on any of the committees which were responsible for the instruction program of the schools. Representation by wards tended to lead the boards into the consideration of problems on the basis of sections or districts. The wards which were represented by strong and active men secured an amount of funds and school facilities which the less favored wards were unable to secure.

The large number of committees hindered the boards in an expeditious management of the business coming before them. Matters brought to the attention of a board meeting were referred to committees. The committees, through neglect or lack of dispatch, often would not act on the referred business for several months. In the meantime the program of the schools would be

handicapped because of the delay. Some of the committees were clothed with both legislative and executive powers. These committees performed professional duties which the school district paid a special executive to perform.

The unwieldy organizations were gradually modified and placed on a more efficient basis. Two factors seem to have been responsible for the modification. Some of the members of the boards of education grew impatient and critical of the gross delay and inefficiency. It is also possible that the growth of confidence in the ability of the superintendent became a factor in the change. The superintendent, through experience and through a careful analysis of the problems of school administration, gained respect and recognition from the boards of education with which he worked. The delegation of powers and duties to the superintendent of schools usually transcended the laws made to govern such delegations. The superintendent who proved by his achievements that he was capable and reliable was likely to have more and more duties and responsibilities added to his quota.

The first step necessary in the reorganization of the administrative machinery of the schools was a reduction in the size of the boards of education. This step began to be taken about 1900, and instead of boards numbering thirty, fifty, and even several hundred, they were reduced to seven, nine, or eleven members. When the boards were reduced in size the number of standing committees was also reduced. This change made it necessary to entrust more responsibilities to the superintendent of schools. The board of education became a legislative rather than both a legislative and an executive organization. The executive functions were delegated to the superintendent and he was officially designated the executive officer of the board of education. The superintendent was then no longer hampered by the necessity of waiting for or working with standing committees of the board. He began to perform duties which should have been delegated to his office many years before, but which could not be assigned to the superintendent so long as the standing committees were in existence. This modification in the organization of boards of education marks the beginning of the real development of the position of superintendent of schools. When the superintendent was designated the executive officer of the board of education he made the position one of direction and leadership of the school system. The reduction in the size of boards of education made one other far-reaching change. Members of the board were elected from the city at large rather than from wards. The elimination of ward representation eradicated an evil of long standing in the method by which teachers were nominated and elected. Teachers were no

longer nominated by members of boards of education in return for political or personal favors, but were recommended and nominated by the superintendents of schools.

The Superintendent as an Executive Officer

The course of study which was an early responsibility of superintendents continued as an ever-present problem. All of the difficulties inherent in the establishment of a graded course of study were not solved when the first course was adopted. Actual use of the course of study developed situations and conditions which could not be anticipated when it was formulated. Perhaps the time allowed for the completion of a given amount of work was too long or too brief; in either event considerable readjustment of the materials or time was necessary. The superintendent of schools was responsible for making and directing the necessary adjustments.

Changes in the economic and social structures of cities brought demands for the inclusion of new subjects in the curriculum of the public schools. Evidence from annual reports indicates that the superintendents were usually in the van when the insistence on the addition of new subjects culminated in their addition. Interests not directly connected with the school organization seemed, in some cases, to dominate the demands for the inclusion of new subjects. However, it will never be known just how much of the outside insistence was inspired and directed by the wishes and activities of the superintendent. Some additions were manual training, domestic science, music, health, art, commercial education, and the kindergarten. These additions made it necessary to revise the curriculum, readjust the time allotments, and make other modifications for including them in the curriculum. The plans for these changes were developed or directed by the superintendent of schools. After the curriculum had been modified to include the innovations, the superintendent was responsible for all the measures necessary to make the curriculum a smooth functioning and unified whole.

The superintendents originated or aided the movements which eventuated, beginning about 1880, in the enactment of compulsory school attendance laws. The passage of these laws brought a group of children into the schools who had not been attending school at all or who had attended very irregularly. Several problems were added to the responsibilities of the superintendents when these children were forced to attend school. Their attendance in some cities revealed the fact that the school plant was inadequate to house all the children of school age. Many of the

children were retarded and consequently were over-age for their grades. Serious difficulties resulted when the large and over-age children were placed in the grades consisting of young and normal-progress children. These difficulties made it necessary for special rooms to be provided for the retarded children. The course of study which was designed for normal-progress children had to be modified and adapted to the needs of the children who required special classes. Some of the children who were forced into school by the provisions of the compulsory school-attendance laws were either actual or potential criminals. The proclivities of this group of children made it necessary for detention and reform schools to be established. But the superintendent had achieved his goal, namely, that all the children of the city were being given the benefits of school attendance.

The enforcement of the provisions of the compulsory school-attendance laws brought another group of children into school, the mental and physical deviates. If these children were not to become complete adult charges of society, it was necessary to assist them in developing their physical and mental capacities to the fullest extent. It was not always possible for this development to be made in the existing schools which were organized and operated for the education of normal children. The superintendent, therefore, found it necessary to organize and administer schools for deviate children. This organization required another adjustment in the course of study.

The growth in the size and complexity of city school systems caused a corresponding increase in the costs of the schools. The mounting costs stimulated careful study of the organization and operation of the school system. The studies could not be made adequately unless comprehensive data were collected, analyzed, and evaluated. The data could not, because of lack of time, be collected by the existing administrative staff. Fact-finding or research bureaus were established on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools and were placed under the control and general direction of the superintendent. Baltimore is given credit for having established the first bureau in 1912. The findings of these bureaus enabled superintendents to base their decisions on facts rather than on opinion. Armed with facts, the superintendents were better able to convince boards of education and the public that the policies of the school system were sound.

The fact-finding bureaus made valuable discoveries in connection with the manner in which children learn. These discoveries led to the conviction that the curriculum of the schools should never be allowed to become static. The curriculum which is most likely to meet best the needs of the children and of society is

the curriculum which is constantly undergoing revision and experimentation, provided, of course, that the revision and experimentation are conducted along the lines which are indicated by the findings of careful, critical, and exhaustive investigation. The superintendents as a result of these convictions recommended that organizations responsible for constant curriculum revision and experimentation be set up in the city school systems. The work of these organizations is directed by the superintendent or by a person designated by that officer.

The early superintendents were vested with very meager responsibilities for school buildings and finance. Most of the early city schools were housed in quarters which were not the property of the city. These quarters were frequently inadequate, unsanitary, and unsuitable for use as schools. The superintendents were confronted and handicapped by two problems, (1) how to get the schools out of the unsatisfactory privately owned quarters and (2) how to get sufficient responsibility over the school building procedure to enable them to secure buildings of the type which would adequately house the kind of schools required. These problems were intensified by reason of the fact that funds were lacking and the erection of school buildings was, in many cities, the responsibility of the city council or of some body under the direction of the city council. In some cases the superintendents were directed to advise with the authority which was responsible for the erection of school buildings. But the advice of the superintendents was not always asked for, and was not always heeded when given.

The unsatisfactory conditions engendered by overcrowding and lack of adequate school buildings continued to be a problem for a great many years. The boards of education were not always responsible for the acute school building shortages which developed in some cities. The conditions might have been alleviated, if the boards of education had been in control of the erection of school buildings and of the finances. The superintendents suggested temporary expedients, such as half-day sessions, temporary and cheap buildings, schools housed in rented quarters; but the solution of the problem was not reached. Many children were attending school in quarters unfit for school use and many children were not attending school at all in spite of the compulsory school-attendance laws.

When boards of education were reduced in size and the superintendent of schools was made the executive officer, a new attack was made on the problem of supplying adequate school buildings. The superintendent through the aid of the administrative staff and later with the help of the fact-finding bureaus began

to attack seriously the problems of school housing. Studies which showed the annual growth of the schools and the trends of the increase in school population were made. The existing school plant was surveyed and its length of service was estimated. The growth of population studies made by utility companies serving the city were used to forecast growth and the mobility of the school population. The superintendent, aided by the surveys, was able to predict school building requirements over a period of years and to formulate a school-building program which would meet the needs. The finances necessary to carry out the building programs were frequently provided through the issuance of bonds. A large factor in the success of the bond issues was the growing confidence which the voters placed in the superintendent of schools and his policies. The problem of overcrowding of school buildings and of inadequate school facilities did not disappear entirely, but conditions were becoming much better than they had ever been.

The financial outlay for schools increased with alarming rapidity during the period from 1900 to 1930. A large number of school buildings were erected and the program of the schools was expanded. If the school district expected to continue to receive the increasingly large sums of money which it needed to carry out the program which had been planned, it was necessary to insist on the adoption of stricter accounting procedures. The adoption of the accounting procedures placed the schools on a sounder and more defensible financial status than had been the case up to that time. The development of a unified system of school accounting for all cities enabled the superintendents to compare the costs of school services in a number of cities. The superintendent was able to devise and insist on stricter accounting procedures through the help of the fact-finding bureaus which had been established.

The expansion of the school system and its attendant increase in financial outlay could not have been accomplished without the active support of the tax-paying public. However, public support of schools is not confined to the payment of taxes. Public support to be most effective requires loyal and understanding coöperation in all of the endeavors of the school program. The public will not support a movement or an institution until and unless they are fully informed concerning it. The superintendents of schools used a number of means and agencies to supply the public with the information needed. Existing civic and community organizations were given information concerning the plans and purposes of the school program. New organizations which had for their chief purpose the establishment of closer and more effective relationships between the school and the home were formed. The fact-finding bureaus of the city school systems provided the

public with a type of information which was both timely and specific. This was done through the circulation of special school bulletins and the release of carefully compiled and edited information to the public press. Through these various agencies the superintendent kept not only the school program but also his measures for the improvement of the program constantly before the public.

The position of superintendent of schools in American cities is less than one hundred years old. When the position was created it gave little promise of developing into an office of significance. The early superintendents were head teachers employed in most cases to assume responsibility for some of the instructional problems and phases of the school system. Boards of education were reluctant to assign major responsibilities to the new officer. The public schools had been operated by means of lay management for almost two hundred years. As the cities grew in size and the number of children, school buildings, employees, and the amount of funds expended increased, the tasks of school administration became increasingly technical. Through careful, consistent, and continuous study of the problems connected with the administration of city schools the superintendents demonstrated their ability to cope successfully with the changing conditions which were arising. The successful management of the responsibilities entrusted to them gave the boards of education increased confidence in the ability and judgment of the superintendents and led to the gradual assignment of more and greater responsibilities to these officers. Today in most American cities of more than 100,000 population the superintendents of schools are the executive officers of the school systems. The superintendents have become or are becoming the responsible leaders of city schools in all phases of public school administration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY*

Books

- Ayres, Leonard P. Laggards in Our Schools. New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1909.
- Bourne, William Oland. History of the Public School Society of the City of New York. New York: William Wood and Co., 1870.
- Carlton, Frank T. Economic Influences Upon Education Progress in the United States, 1820-1850. Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin. Madison, 1908.
- Chapman, H. B. Organized Research in Education. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1927.
- Moehlman, A. B. Public Education in Detroit. Bloomington: Public School Publishing Co., 1924.
- Philbrick, John D. City School Systems of the United States -- Circular of Information of Bureau of Education Number One. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1885.
- Wolcott, Oliver. Message of His Excellency Oliver Wolcott, Governor of the State of Connecticut to the General Assembly, May Session, 1825. Hartford: Charles Babcock (Printer), 1825.
- An Account of the Louisville City Schools, Together with the Ordinances of the City Council. Louisville: City Council, 1830.
- Annals of the Boston Primary School Committee. Boston: School Committee, 1860.
- Journal of Proceedings of American Institute of Instruction. Portsmouth: American Institute of Instruction, 1869.
- Ordinances of the City of Chicago, compiled by Arno Voss, Corporation Counsel. Chicago: City Council, 1853.

Manuscripts

- "Minutes of Trustees and Visitors of the Common Schools of Cincinnati," April 24, 1850.
- "Minutes of Board of Directors of School District of Kansas City," July 7, 1868.

*Source materials are indicated in Table I, p. 3.

"Minutes of Board of Directors of Public Schools of the Second Municipality of New Orleans," November, 1841.

"Minutes of the School Committee of Providence," May 8, 1839.

"Minutes of Regular Meeting of the Board of School Directors of District Number One, Seattle," October 26, 1882.

Gregory, L. H. "History of the Superintendency of the Louisville Schools." Unpublished Manuscript, Louisville, Ky., 1928.

Miscellaneous Materials

Acts of a General Nature Passed at the Twenty-seventh General Assembly, Vol. XXVII. Columbus: Olmstead, Bailhache and Cameron State Printers, 1829.

Acts of a Local Nature Passed by the Forty-eighth General Assembly, Vol. XLVIII. Columbus: Scott and Bascum State Printers.

Baurenschmidt, Mrs. William. Letter to the author. Baltimore, Nov. 22, 1933.

Charter of the City Together with a Revised Code of Ordinances. Houston: City Council, December, 1886.

Connecticut Public Acts, 1856. Chap. xli, "An Act in Addition to and in Revision of an Act Called 'An Act of Education'."

Kentucky, Laws, Statutes, etc. Collection of the acts of Virginia and Kentucky relative to Louisville and Portland: with the charter of the city of Louisville and the Amendments thereto made under the direction of the Mayor and Council. Louisville: Prentice and Deissinger, 1839.

The Ohio Educational Monthly and the National Teacher, Akron, 1887. Reprint of Chapter I, Vol. II (Pages 6-21) Fifteenth Census Reports on Population. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1933.

The White-Williams Foundation for Girls One Hundred and Nineteenth Annual Report. Philadelphia: White-Williams Foundation, 1918.

The White-Williams Foundation Five Years' Review. Philadelphia: White-Williams Foundation, 1922.

